



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 116th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 165

WASHINGTON, FRIDAY, MARCH 8, 2019

No. 42

Senate

The Senate was not in session today. Its next meeting will be held on Monday, March 11, 2019, at 3 p.m.

House of Representatives

FRIDAY, MARCH 8, 2019

The House met at 9 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Ms. DEGETTE).

DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
March 8, 2019.

I hereby appoint the Honorable DIANA DEGETTE to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

NANCY PELOSI,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Patrick J. Conroy, offered the following prayer: God of the universe, we give You thanks for giving us another day.

We ask Your blessing upon this assembly and upon all who call upon Your name. Send Your spirit to fill their hearts with those divine gifts You have prepared for them.

May Your grace find expression in their compassion for the weak and the poor among us, and may Your mercy encourage good will in all they do and accomplish this day.

As the Members of the people's House face the demands of our time, grant them and us all Your peace and strength, that we might act justly, love tenderly, and walk humbly with You.

May all that is done this day be for Your greater honor and glory.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House her approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

Mr. TAKANO. Madam Speaker, pursuant to clause 1, rule I, I demand a vote on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. TAKANO. Madam Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8, rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from California (Mr. LOWENTHAL) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. LOWENTHAL led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Repub-

lic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will entertain up to five requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

REDISTRICTING REFORM

(Mr. LOWENTHAL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LOWENTHAL. Madam Speaker, I am pleased and proud to stand here in support of H.R. 1, but I am especially proud that H.R. 1 contains the Redistricting Reform Act, legislation that was introduced by Representatives LOFGREN, BROWNLEY, and myself.

This legislation would require States to create independent redistricting commissions to draw congressional seats, removing politicians and partisan gerrymandering from the process.

I have worked for decades on this cause. I helped to lead in the California Legislature on redistricting efforts, which ultimately led to the creation of the California independent redistricting commission, which is now recognized as one of the best practices in redistricting.

Let's follow this example across the country. Let's have Members here who represent fair and equitable districts and who are elected to represent their districts and not just to protect incumbency.

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H2589

PROMOTING AMERICAN VALUES THROUGH PEACE CORPS

(Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, 58 years ago this week, President John F. Kennedy signed an executive order establishing the United States Peace Corps. Since then, more than 200,000 Americans have participated in international service opportunities through the Peace Corps.

International service organizations like the Peace Corps and student exchange programs operated by the Department of State play an important role in promoting the image of America around the world. These programs provide American volunteers with a chance to learn about their host country's society and values, and, in turn, volunteers share American culture and values with the people of their host country. This fosters a great understanding of and strong friendship between our country and those around the world.

The Peace Corps was created with the strong belief that Americans are willing to contribute part of their life to the country. President Kennedy said that we must not merely aim to have an economic advantage in life, but we must strive for a greater purpose. Madam Speaker, for 58 years, the United States Peace Corps has provided thousands of Americans with that greater purpose.

EXPANDING VOTING OPPORTUNITIES FOR ALL AMERICANS

(Mr. PANETTA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PANETTA. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 1 so that more Americans can exercise their right to vote.

On election day of last year, voters in my district on the central coast of California set a new record for turnout in a midterm election.

In San Benito County, we saw one of the highest increases in the State for folks registering to vote.

In Monterey County, the majority of registered voters voted by absentee ballot and by mail. These are service-members who filled out their ballot from where they were stationed and also folks at home who could take time to thoughtfully cast their vote.

Unfortunately, on that same election day, voters around this country didn't have that opportunity, and they had to go to polling places where they faced malfunctioning voting machines and found their registration frozen or purged.

These instances left thousands of citizens without a vote and without a voice in our democracy. That is why we need to pass H.R. 1.

The most important persons in our democracy are not those who hold office, but it is those educated and informed voters who put us in office. Let's give those types of voters more opportunity to participate in our democracy and pass H.R. 1.

GOVERNMENT TRANSPARENCY

(Mr. COLLINS of Georgia asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Madam Speaker, last Congress, the Judiciary Committee interviewed multiple DOJ and FBI officials about their actions regarding the 2016 elections.

People anticipate the Mueller report soon. Will he find any so-called collusion, or was the only collusion among agency personnel who hated the President and started this investigation?

Our interview transcripts were pertinent to a congressional investigation; but the 115th Congress ended, the investigation was closed, and copies were shared with certain Members of Congress.

Out of an abundance of caution, we gave DOJ an opportunity to review them for information that would endanger national security; but after many months and little progress, our patience grows thin.

The proposed redactions had nothing to do with national security and are anathema to our goal of government transparency. I am, therefore, today making one of those transcripts public.

Madam Speaker, to avoid burdening GPO with a 200-page transcript, I include in the RECORD the link www.dougcollins.house.gov/ohr so the American people can review the transcript of Bruce Ohr.

I intend to make other transcripts public soon. I am willing to consider any reasonable redactions DOJ makes in a timely manner but won't allow these transcripts to remain shrouded in secrecy.

A VICTORY FOR AMERICAN FAMILIES

(Mrs. BUSTOS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. BUSTOS. Madam Speaker, we are delivering a major victory for American families today, a victory for transparency, integrity, and accountability in our democracy.

I am proud to have helped introduce H.R. 1, the For the People Act, because, in every corner of Illinois, I hear from folks who are frustrated about politics. They are frustrated with the secret and dark money that enters politics; they are frustrated by the self-dealing in Washington; and they are frustrated by the culture of corruption that rewards the powerful while the voices of hardworking Americans are drowned out.

Our For the People Act will bring fundamental change to Washington.

Our bill will end the dominance of big money in politics; it will ensure that elections are fair; and it will make sure Congress is working for the people instead of for themselves, banning Members from serving on corporate boards.

Our For the People Act will make it easier to vote.

Madam Speaker, the American people sent us here to clean up the mess in Washington. Today we are delivering on that promise.

HONORING VETERAN OF THE MONTH PETER LUITWIELER

(Mr. KEVIN HERN of Oklahoma asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KEVIN HERN of Oklahoma. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor Peter E. Luitwieler, an American hero and a true friend to our country's veterans.

Mr. Luitwieler served in military intelligence during the Vietnam war, and in January of 1968, when his compound was surrounded by enemy troops and the machine gunners abandoned their posts, Mr. Luitwieler and a brave marine manned the machine guns for hours, keeping the enemies at bay and protecting the lives of their team. For this act of bravery, he was awarded the Vietnamese equivalent of the Bronze Star.

After he retired, Mr. Luitwieler dedicated his time to fellow veterans. He now serves as a program manager for Warrior Partnerships of Eastern Oklahoma and the Oklahoma Veterans Connections, and he is a mentor to veterans going through the Tulsa Veterans Treatment Court, going above and beyond to enrich the lives of Oklahoma's veterans.

Mr. Luitwieler is an incredible example of the great men and women who have served our country every day. He is the First District's March 2019 Veteran of the Month, and I am honored to recognize him with this award.

HONORING POLICE CHIEF KRISTEN ZIMAN ON INTERNATIONAL WOMEN'S DAY

(Ms. UNDERWOOD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. UNDERWOOD. Madam Speaker, I rise today on International Women's Day to honor a woman who has been a pillar of strength in my community during a particularly difficult time.

Last month, in Aurora, Illinois, we had five neighbors killed in a terrible act of gun violence. If you watched the news following that tragedy, you saw a woman, Chief of Police Kristen Ziman, exuding strength, compassion, resolve, and leadership following an event we never imagined would happen in our community.

Chief Ziman leads the second biggest police department in our State of Illinois—no small feat considering that

there are only 219 female chiefs in the more than 14,000 police departments nationwide.

Chief Ziman's compassionate leadership and barrier-breaking approach to law enforcement inspires us all across the Fox Valley region. We truly are Aurora strong.

Her strength and her service to our community makes us so proud, and I look forward to watching all the little girls in our community grow up knowing they can be anything they want to be, from a police chief to a Congresswoman, because they grew up seeing it firsthand.

There are women like Chief Ziman lifting all of our communities all over the 14th District and all over our country, and I am so glad to celebrate them today.

FLORIDA STRAWBERRY FESTIVAL

(Mr. SPANO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SPANO. Madam Speaker, I rise today to commemorate a tradition that has come to define a small town in rural Florida.

Every winter, Plant City transforms for the Strawberry Festival, an event to celebrate the annual strawberry harvest.

When the festival was founded in 1930, it was a way for the residents of Plant City to not only mark a new crop of strawberries, but also was one of the few times a year locals could eat strawberries, due to their short shelf life.

Today, the 11-day event attracts guests far beyond Plant City, and the strawberry growers in the community now supply virtually all winter strawberries grown in the United States. This success comes at the hard work of growers in Plant City.

These entrepreneurial men and women work tirelessly to bring us the strawberries many of us enjoy, and I want to take this opportunity to thank them for all that they do for us. Strawberries have become the lifeblood of Plant City, and our community wouldn't be what it is today without them.

I also want to take this time to congratulate Kendall Gaudens, who was crowned this year's Strawberry Festival Queen. Kendall joins the illustrious ranks of many great women before her, including Florida's current attorney general, my friend Ashley Moody.

I also want to congratulate Madilyn Conrad, who was named first maid, and Kennedy Cullins, Jada Brown, and Olivia Frazier, who were selected for the court.

□ 0915

CONGRATULATING THE McFARLAND HIGH SCHOOL GIRLS BASKETBALL TEAM

(Mr. COX of California asked and was given permission to address the House

for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. COX of California. Madam Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the McFarland High School girls basketball team. Undeclared in regular season Division IV play, our girls were moved up to Division III for State. Undaunted, the team's motto is "relentless," and that is what they have been.

On Tuesday night, our girls brought home the school's first Southern California Regional Championship. They are a textbook example of what can be accomplished through hard work, practice, and teamwork.

Led by coaches Johnny Samaniego and Gino Barajas, the girls: Lucia Barajas, Heiry Bojorquez, Neli Diaz, Angelica Gonzalez, Emily Gonzalez, Julie Hernandez, Adilene Lopez, Shania Perry, Lucia Rocha, Kathy Rodriguez, and Pilar Samaniego are now playing Oakland High School, represented by my friend and colleague, BARBARA LEE, in tonight's State Championship game.

I ask my colleagues to join me in sending them the best of luck. We are so proud of our girls and their families.

Go Cougars.

FUND THE POLITICIANS ACT

(Mrs. HARTZLER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. HARTZLER. Madam Speaker, today I raise my objection to H.R. 1, the so-called For the People Act. This act should really be called the Fund the Politicians Act. It is a Federal takeover of our election system. It opens up our precious election system to fraud, and it violates free speech rights.

This bill would allow for the funding of politicians' campaigns. They would be given a 6-to-1 match with government money for their campaigns. I don't believe Americans want their money going to help pay for more robocalls from politicians that they don't even support.

It also will give \$25 to citizens to give to a campaign of their choice. What a terrible use of our tax dollars.

It also opens up our system to fraud by requiring that they have to allow for online registration, same-day registration, and it nullifies all the State protections. No Secretary of State was even consulted about this bill.

And finally, it violates our free speech rights by requiring the publishing of the names and addresses of donors to organizations who may speak about a candidate.

This bill is terrible. Every vote should count, and no government money should go to line politicians' campaigns.

FOR THE PEOPLE ACT OF 2019

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. UNDERWOOD). Pursuant to House Resolution 172 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of

the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 1.

Will the gentlewoman from Colorado (Ms. DEGETTE) kindly take the chair.

□ 0917

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 1) to expand Americans' access to the ballot box, reduce the influence of big money in politics, and strengthen ethics rules for public servants, and for other purposes, with Ms. DEGETTE (Acting Chair) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose on Thursday, March 7, 2019, amendment No. 69 printed in part B of House Report 116-16 offered by the gentlewoman from Michigan (Ms. SLOTKIN) had been disposed of.

AMENDMENT NO. 70 OFFERED BY MR. NEGUSE

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 70 printed in part B of House Report 116-16.

Mr. NEGUSE. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of subtitle A of title I of the bill, insert the following:

PART 8—VOTER REGISTRATION OF MINORS

SEC. 1081. ACCEPTANCE OF VOTER REGISTRATION APPLICATIONS FROM INDIVIDUALS UNDER 18 YEARS OF AGE.

(a) ACCEPTANCE OF APPLICATIONS.—Section 8 of the National Voter Registration Act of 1993 (52 U.S.C. 20507) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsection (k), as redesignated by section 1004, as subsection (l); and

(2) by inserting after subsection (j), as inserted by such section 1004, the following new subsection:

“(k) ACCEPTANCE OF APPLICATIONS FROM INDIVIDUALS UNDER 18 YEARS OF AGE.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—A State may not refuse to accept or process an individual's application to register to vote in elections for Federal office on the grounds that the individual is under 18 years of age at the time the individual submits the application, so long as the individual is at least 16 years of age at such time.

“(2) NO EFFECT ON STATE VOTING AGE REQUIREMENTS.—Nothing in paragraph (1) may be construed to require a State to permit an individual who is under 18 years of age at the time of an election for Federal office to vote in the election.”.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply with respect to elections occurring on or after January 1, 2020.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 172, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. NEGUSE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. NEGUSE. Madam Chair, I am proud to offer an amendment today to ensure early registration, or pre-registration, for all 16- and 17-year-olds

across the country ahead of their 18th birthday.

To be clear, my amendment does not lower the voting age; it simply allows individuals to pre-register so they are registered and ready to vote when they turn 18.

Today, 14 States, including my home State, the great State of Colorado, as well as the District of Columbia, permit pre-registration beginning at 16 years old. Four States permit pre-registration beginning at 17 years old, and five other States allow for pre-registration a few months ahead of voters' 18th birthday.

States across the Nation are taking up pre-registration to integrate young people in the democratic process early, and I think it is time for us to take up these reforms at the Federal level.

We see young people interacting with the government agencies most frequently when they are 16 and getting their driver's license or learner's permit. This is common sense to allow our young folks to register early when they are already at the Department of Motor Vehicles in their respective State, where voter registration services are typically offered, to ensure that when they turn 18, they have no barriers to casting their ballot on election day.

Madam Chair, the foundation of our democracy is built on the ability of our citizens to vote. We must hold this right precious and sacred, and we must encourage, in my view, our citizens of every age, from every background and every locality and every local party to engage in our political process. Pre-registration helps us do that by investing in our next generation and by encouraging democratic participation from an early age.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Chair, I claim the time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Chair, I thank my new colleague, Mr. NEGUSE, and welcome him. I am glad he is participating in the process.

I am going to oppose the gentleman's amendment; not because of the process, just because it adds another layer of burden to our States and our localities.

Many States already accept pre-registration forms, and that is within their State's jurisdiction to do so. I just don't like this top-down approach which this now upwards of 700-page mammoth bill called H.R. 1 is putting on to our States and our local election officials.

Our county offices, our local officials, they are bleeding from unfunded mandates from State and Federal Governments, and this is one more of those.

I agree, we ought to get more 16- and 17-year-olds interested in government. I have got twin boys who are 18; I try

and get them interested. Sometimes they are not even interested in me and what we do.

But the key is we, as Members of Congress, ought to go take our message to the high schools. And I just recently was in Boston with a bipartisan group in and around our colleague, JOE KENNEDY's district.

JOE, MARKWAYNE MULLIN, and LISA BLUNT ROCHESTER and I, we visited numerous high schools. And I hope all four of us standing there in a bipartisan way actually inspired some young people in the Boston area to get engaged.

My colleague, JIMMY PANETTA and I visited schools in my district last fall to do the exact same thing, to show people that we can work together in a bipartisan way.

Unfortunately, this process in H.R. 1 has been nothing but partisan; and that is not the message that we need to send to 16- and 17-year-olds.

I have put my hand out with an olive branch. I have accepted many Democratic amendments throughout the last few days, and not one single amendment, either in the markup of the only committee that marked this bill up, House Administration, where we offered 28, not one Republican amendment to this bill that is now 700 pages has been accepted. Every amendment has been a Democrat-led amendment.

I thought the new Democratic majority was going to be bipartisan. I thought the new Democratic majority was going to be transparent. I thought the new Democratic majority was going to not work with special interests to write mammoth 700-page bills. But I guess, Madam Chair, I was mistaken.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NEGUSE. Madam Chair, I thank my colleague from the other side of the aisle for his thoughtful comments. I would say that I think this amendment is a bipartisan amendment in the sense that it will apply equally to every 16- and 17-year-old across the country, irrespective of their political affiliation.

In Colorado actually, in some months we have had more Republican 16- and 17-year-olds pre-register than Democrat 16- and 17-year-olds. So really what this is all about is just ensuring that young folks in our country are able to integrate into the political process and engage in their civic duties at an earlier age.

From my perspective—I appreciate the gentleman's comments with respect to visiting high schools. I certainly do that quite a bit in my district, to meet with young folks, to talk to them about how to become better citizens and engaged in their community. And often the question I get is, How? And I think this is a great answer.

The ability to say to them that if they go, when they get their driver's license, and pre-register to vote so that, ultimately, when they turn 18 they are automatically registered and ready to

participate in our elections; I think that, at the end of the day, it will do a great service to our country and get more young people involved in our political process.

Madam Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LOFGREN), a distinguished colleague and the chair of our Immigration Subcommittee and, of course, the chair of the House Administration Committee. Ms. LOFGREN.

Ms. LOFGREN. Madam Chair, I just want to express my thanks to the gentleman from Colorado for offering this refining amendment. I think he is exactly right. In order to fully engage the American people, we need to make every effort for them to participate.

And for young people who feel that they really don't have a say, allowing them to pre-register helps them buy in to our American system of government.

You know, somebody on the other side of the building said, well, this is a power grab, to make sure that—H.R. 1 is a power grab. It is. It is a power grab for the American people, to take the power away from the special interests and give it to the American people. The gentleman's amendment helps further that worthy goal, and I thank him for offering it.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Chair, I thank my colleague, Mr. NEGUSE, again. I admire his tenacity, and admire his willingness to come down and legislate. I stand ready to come to his district and talk to high schoolers with him, and I would hope he would reciprocate, come to mine. If the gentleman will have his team call mine, we will figure out a way to work something out. I think that is the best way for us to send a message to high schoolers to get them engaged, get them involved.

This is just an administrative burden that is going to affect our State and local officials. To process—I mean, there are provisions in this 700-page mammoth bill that don't allow our local election officials to clean voters off the rolls that they know no longer may live in their jurisdiction. So we are hindering local officials' ability to clean up their rolls; and then decide, you know, later on, that we are going to be ahead and pre-register people that we don't know, may or may not want to vote in their college town of residence.

So it just is a burden that I think is unnecessary. Although, again, I respect the gentleman's willingness to come down here and debate; this is an issue that goes further than Mr. NEGUSE's amendment.

I am going to oppose the amendment. I urge folks to vote "no" on it. But more importantly, I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this bill that is going to eventually cost taxpayers billions of dollars and add billions upon billions to the campaign coffers of Members of Congress. That is not what the taxpayers in my district are asking

for. It is not what the taxpayers of America are asking for. It is only what the Democratic majority is asking for.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NEGUSE. Madam Chair, I certainly will take my colleague up on his invitation, and look forward to visiting his district and having him come to Boulder and Fort Collins, where I know there are plenty of 16- and 17-year-olds who are very eager to be able to advocate for other young folks to be able to pre-register in other States, as they have been able to in Colorado, thanks to the incredible election reforms that we have enacted in our State.

I understand that we have a respectful disagreement with respect to the merits of the underlying bill, but I would hope that, on this particular amendment that is not particularly controversial and that, as I said, is really a nonpartisan approach to just getting young folks of all political affiliations involved in our political process.

I would hope and trust that colleagues in both parties here in this Chamber would think about this amendment thoughtfully, and I would certainly urge them to support it.

Madam Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Chair, we know this bill is not going to be signed into law. I look forward to working with the gentleman on other amendments that we might be able to come up with some good plans to engage our 16- and 17-year-olds, engage the next generation of leaders.

I hope maybe a visit that we can do together could inspire somebody to do what we do one day, and that would be that we would manage to call ourselves successful in legislating to inspire the next generation.

This bill, H.R. 1, is not going to inspire the next generation. I appreciate Mr. NEGUSE; I appreciate his willingness to serve.

Madam Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. NEGUSE).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. NEGUSE. Madam Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 71 OFFERED BY MRS. KIRKPATRICK

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 71 printed in part B of House Report 116-16.

Mrs. KIRKPATRICK. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 365, strike lines 15 through 24 and insert the following:

“(6) SAFE HARBOR FOR PLATFORMS MAKING BEST EFFORTS TO IDENTIFY REQUESTS WHICH ARE SUBJECT TO RECORD MAINTENANCE REQUIREMENTS.—

“(A) AVAILABILITY OF SAFE HARBOR.—In accordance with rules established by the Commission, if an online platform shows that the platform used best efforts to determine whether or not a request to purchase a qualified political advertisement was subject to the requirements of this subsection, the online platform shall not be considered to be in violation of such requirements.

“(B) SPECIAL RULES FOR DISBURSEMENT PAID WITH CREDIT CARD.—For purposes of subparagraph (A), an online platform shall be considered to have used best efforts in the case of a purchase of a qualified political advertisement which is made with a credit card if—

“(i) the individual or entity making such purchase is required, at the time of making such purchase, to disclose the credit verification value of such credit card; and

“(ii) the billing address associated with such credit card is located in the United States or, in the case of a purchase made by an individual who is a United States citizen living outside of the United States, the individual provides the online platform with the United States mailing address the individual uses for voter registration purposes.”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 172, the gentlewoman from Arizona (Mrs. KIRKPATRICK) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Arizona.

Mrs. KIRKPATRICK. Madam Chair, I strongly support H.R. 1, and I commend Congressman JOHN SARBANES for his persistent work on this legislation. We have an opportunity here to reduce the role of dark money in politics and make it easier for Americans to participate in our democracy.

This is not a partisan issue. This is an American democracy issue, and H.R. 1 is the best solution to cleaning up corruption in Washington.

I am proud of my colleagues for working on this historic and necessary package.

□ 0930

You see, Madam Chair, I ran as a publicly funded candidate in Arizona under our public financing law called Clean Elections when I first ran for the legislature. This meant I had to go out and get a certain number of \$5 contributions from constituents in my district, which I then turned in to get my public financing.

It was the same for everyone who was running as a Clean Election candidate, regardless of party. It equalized everything.

One of my favorite stories is that I was walking from my law office down to the post office to check my mail, and this cowboy pulled up in his pickup truck at a stoplight and rolled down the window, and he said, “Hey, ANN. You don’t know me, but I gave you \$5.”

So he felt empowered in my election. I walked over, and we had a conversation in the middle of the street.

That is the way it should be. This puts power in the pocket of the people,

not special interests, and that is the way it should be.

It is the For the People Act, and that empowers people, and that makes our democracy work.

I offer my amendment because it creates transparency in the process. This amendment was actually suggested by a Republican colleague. It requires the disclosure of credit card verification value and billing address information for purchases of online advertising. The credit card verification value is an antifraud security technology designed to protect us and to reduce fraudulent activity.

We know that there are bad actors and foreign nationals out there that have an interest in influencing our American elections through online advertising. Haven’t we seen that very, very well in the last couple of years. We have loopholes that allow them to do so, but we can fix that. Not only can we fix it, we must fix it.

This amendment is a commonsense solution to help protect the integrity of our elections and prevent bad players from compromising our outcomes. This amendment is focused on protecting our democracy through transparency in the digital age.

Madam Chair, I urge you and all my colleagues to support my amendment and the entire H.R. 1 package to clean up Washington and put the American people first.

Remember that cowboy who stopped me in the middle of the road who felt like he was empowered in his election and in his selection of his representative. That is the way it should be.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Chair, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment, even though I am not opposed to it.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Chair, I welcome back my colleague, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK. It is great to have her back in this institution.

The gentlewoman’s amendment is an amendment that I support. However, the underlying bill, H.R. 1, is the furthest thing that can be considered “for the people.” This bill is nothing but a bill that is for loading billions upon billions of dollars into the coffers of Members of Congress.

I don’t think anybody in my district who stops me in the street is saying, “Hey, we want you to take taxpayer dollars away from investing in infrastructure, take taxpayer dollars away from investing in pediatric cancer research, and you know what, load up your campaign coffers with that so you can go enrich some political operatives and maybe buy some more TV commercials and radio ads, send some more mail pieces that get thrown away immediately when they come into your house.”

This has to be one of the worst examples of self-preservation that I have ever witnessed in my 22 years working for the U.S. House of Representatives and serving in the U.S. House of Representatives.

I can't think of one person in my district who has come up and said, "I want you to take tax dollars away from building bridges and roads, finding cures for deadly diseases, and put it in your campaign fund."

That is why this bill is terrible.

This bill has not been open; it has not been a bipartisan process; it has not been regular order, all the things that the Democratic majority promised us that they would do when they took over.

This bill was introduced on January 3. I certainly hope every Democratic Member actually read the bill before they signed on as a cosponsor, but I think they are reading it now. And there are a lot of problems, which is why we have so many amendments.

Let me go through some of the process. We requested a CBO score—it was delivered last Friday; it was updated yesterday—which actually agrees with me that taxpayer dollars are going to be taken away from other priorities that we can spend here in Congress, like roads and bridges, cancer research, Alzheimer's research, and others, and go toward Members of Congress' campaigns.

Hours before the only committee markup that we saw with the majority, an amendment in the nature of a substitute with new text, including a magical, new freedom from influence fund that would supposedly support the enrichment of Members of Congress' campaigns, it had no details on how that fund would be filled.

We went through the markup. Only one committee, the smallest committee in Congress, House Administration, it was the only committee that marked this up. That is not regular order. Forty percent of the bill has never gone through regular order.

Yet we see now 72 amendments over the last few days. Twenty-eight of them that we offered to try to make the bill better in committee were all turned down on a partisan roll call.

Then we went to Rules. I actually had a good time in Rules. I have to thank my colleague, Chairperson LOFGREN, for that debate during the Rules Committee.

We again received new text of the bill 10 minutes before I walked in, 10 minutes before, including 51 new pages. Where was this in the markup process?

After the Rules hearing and before consideration on the floor, we learned through leaks to the press that the new freedom from influence fund would be filled with some magical surcharges of corporate fines, but we had no details.

I had no idea that the Democrats' solution to campaign finance reform and their goal to take corporate money out of politics was to use corporate money to now fund our campaigns, which we now legally cannot accept.

That is the height of hypocrisy. No one is asking for more corporate dollars to line the campaign coffers of Members of Congress.

This bill and the process are just a sham. Look, a joint committee report with revenue stream projections for this new magical freedom from influence fund was not shown to us. It was just submitted for the RECORD. We found it. We saw it.

The new CBO report clearly says this fund will be out of money in just a few years after it becomes activated, because the costs are going to exponentially rise, and clearly, taxpayer dollars will have to bail it out.

The corporate fund, even the CBO and The Washington Post realize that that corporate tax fund, the tax rate of corporate dollars now being funneled into our campaigns that we can't take right now, those corporate dollars and fines will take away from being able to be spent on the priorities of my constituents who stop me in the streets. They say, "We want to build new bridges. We want new roadways. We want to make sure that this bill goes down, because it is a travesty on the American people and the American taxpayer."

Madam Chair, vote "no" on H.R. 1.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. KIRKPATRICK. Madam Chair, while I have the utmost respect and admiration for my colleague across the aisle—in fact, he is one of my favorite Members of Congress—I strongly disagree with his characterization of H.R. 1.

No one knows more than I about dark money, secret money being spent in elections. I have had tens of millions of dollars spent to defeat me, yet I prevail because I have the power of the people.

That is what this bill does. It empowers people just like that cowboy who stopped me with his pickup and contributed \$5 to my legislative election.

Madam Chair, I urge my colleagues to support this election. There is nothing more important than elections in our democracy and empowering the people to participate, nothing. That is the cornerstone of our democracy.

Madam Chair, I yield the balance of my time to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LOFGREN), my esteemed colleague.

Ms. LOFGREN. Madam Chair, I congratulate the gentlewoman from Arizona (Mrs. KIRKPATRICK) on this very smart amendment. I am not surprised. It is typical that she would make this a bipartisan amendment. It is very helpful. It is very smart. I am glad that she is back here in Congress to show this leadership.

Just one word on the CBO: It shows that there is indeed no tax money involved in the freedom from influence fund.

Mrs. KIRKPATRICK. Madam Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Arizona (Mrs. KIRKPATRICK).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 72 OFFERED BY MR. GOLDEN

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 72 printed in part B of House Report 116-16.

Mr. GOLDEN. Madam Chair, I rise today to introduce my amendment to H.R. 1.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 449, strike lines 14 through 20 and insert the following:

"(C) PROHIBITING CERTAIN CANDIDATES FROM QUALIFYING AS PARTICIPATING CANDIDATES.—

"(1) CANDIDATES WITH MULTIPLE CIVIL PENALTIES.—If the Commission assesses 3 or more civil penalties under subsection (a) against a candidate (with respect to either a single election or multiple elections), the Commission may refuse to certify the candidate as a participating candidate under this title with respect to any subsequent election, except that if each of the penalties were assessed as the result of a knowing and willful violation of any provision of this Act, the candidate is not eligible to be certified as a participating candidate under this title with respect to any subsequent election.

"(2) CANDIDATES SUBJECT TO CRIMINAL PENALTY.—A candidate is not eligible to be certified as a participating candidate under this title with respect to an election if a penalty has been assessed against the candidate under section 309(d) with respect to any previous election.

"(d) IMPOSITION OF CRIMINAL PENALTIES.—For criminal penalties for the failure of a participating candidate to comply with the requirements of this title, see section 309(d)."

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 172, the gentleman from Maine (Mr. GOLDEN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maine.

Mr. GOLDEN. Madam Chair, before I talk about my amendment, I would first like to thank Congressman SARBANES for his work on this bill.

H.R. 1 is a comprehensive, good government bill that goes a long way in wresting power away from elites who abuse our political system for narrow self-interests. This legislation would return power where it belongs: in the hands of working people.

As long as corporations and mega-donors finance campaigns, well-connected insiders will continue to call the shots.

Mainers have seen firsthand what can happen when the power is returned to the people. In 1996, our State's voters passed a referendum establishing the Maine Clean Elections Act.

By collecting small donations from people in their communities, Maine candidates refuse the donations of lobbyists and the well-heeled, and concentrate instead on face-to-face conversations with their neighbors. This empowers a community to choose a representative in a battle of ideas instead of a battle of bank accounts.

Maine's clean election reforms have been supported and used by candidates of all parties in my State. Republican,

Democratic, Green Party, and independent candidates have used our clean election system.

In fact, in 2018, a Republican candidate for Governor used the system because he understood that it was going to free him up to spend his time going door to door and talking to the very people who he wanted to represent as Governor of the State of Maine.

Today, we have the opportunity to follow Maine's lead and bring needed reform to the rest of the country.

H.R. 1 allows candidates to refuse donations from mega-donors by implementing a matching system for small-dollar donations from everyday people.

As we have seen in Maine, candidates who use this system are good stewards of the funds they receive. But as with any system, there is potential for bad actors, and it is important that they be held accountable.

My amendment to H.R. 1 ensures that any bad actors are cut off from the matching system and sets high standards for participation. The legislation bars a candidate from using matching funds if the FEC assesses three or more civil penalties against a candidate for violating election laws.

More importantly, if a candidate willfully, knowingly violates the law, my amendment permanently bars them from the program.

Finally, my provision reaffirms that egregious violations of campaign finance laws should result in imprisonment of up to 1 to 5 years.

With H.R. 1 and my amendment, we are creating an accountable election system.

The funds for the matching program, as was just discussed, come from bad corporate actors. These are fines, penalties, and settlements from corporate malfeasance, tax crimes, and other breaches of the public trust. That money can be used to ensure that everyday people who don't have a network of deep money around them, just everyday, working people, will be given the opportunity to compete in a campaign, to go out and represent their people, to go out and spend their time talking to them face-to-face instead of spending their time dialing for dollars and talking to just the very wealthy.

It is time that the people take the power back. By passing my amendment and H.R. 1, we will take that first step. Americans aren't going to let our democracy be taken out from under us any longer.

Madam Chair, I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on this amendment and "yes" on final passage.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Chair, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Chair, I don't have the best Nickelback lyrics to introduce my next speaker, but I yield 1 minute to the

gentleman from California (Mr. MCCARTHY), our Republican leader.

□ 0945

Mr. MCCARTHY. Madam Speaker, I thank the ranking member for his work and his love of music.

This new Democrat socialist majority wants the Federal Government to interfere in our free and fair elections. This bill today, the majority's most important bill, is a massive Federal Government takeover that would undermine the integrity of our elections. But before I explain why, I want to highlight how the majority has gone to great steps to actually hide their prize legislation from the American people.

Madam Speaker, the American public need to understand, when you become the majority, you reserve 1 through 10 of the numbering of bills, and you want to make your number one bill the most important thing you do for America today.

Two years ago we were in the majority, Madam Chair, and we made the most important bill to make sure the people's money went back to them. We wanted to cut your taxes.

The most important bill that the Democrat socialist majority has is to take more of your money and give it to the politicians who want to vote for this bill. How ironic.

Now, because H.R. 1 has had such a broad spectrum of where to go, it was referred to 10 committees. Imagine that, 10 committees.

But 40 percent of this bill has not even been marked up because, what did they do? They only went to one committee.

What committee did they go to? They went to the very special committee, House Administration.

This House Administration, the Members who sit on House Administration, I am sure they are probably selected from the conference committee that goes forward to select individuals for it.

Oh, no, no, no. That is not the committee we went to. House Administration is selected just by two people: the Speaker and the leader. The Speaker and the leader.

And do you know what? It is one of the smallest committees we have. Because if H.R. 1 is so important to the American public, I am sure we would want everybody to see it. But, no, it is just nine people of this House.

And in their jurisdiction, they didn't get to mark up the whole bill. They only had about 60 percent of the bill to mark up.

But I want to thank our Republican colleagues on this committee: first of all, Ranking Member RODNEY DAVIS, MARK WALKER, and BARRY LOUDERMILK. They were very thoughtful.

They realized, even though the chair of the House Administration, when asked during the markup, would the other committees mark up this bill, she promised—she promised—that the

other nine committees would see it, that the other nine committees could mark up that other 40 percent that House Administration didn't get to mark up.

But lo and behold, that is not true. Just as this new Democrat socialist majority said there will be 72 hours before things come to the floor, no. Yesterday we learned that can mean an hour; those other 71 don't matter.

But what the Republicans on the other side of the aisle did, they wanted there to be a thoughtful approach on the issue. They provided 28 amendments to improve H.R. 1.

Do you know how many the Democrats on the other side that the Speaker selected, those six Members—they didn't vote for one of them. They could not find a way that, of those 28 amendments, one of them could be accepted.

I guess the Speaker selected the right people for the House Administration.

Now, they call this bill the For the People Act, but I want to explain why I actually think it is for the politicians, because everyone who votes for this bill today, they are all going to go home a little more excited. Do you know why? They just got the taxpayers to actually fund their elections, and they picked it in a manner where you don't even know, and the multiplying effect of the 6 to 1, who provided it.

So let's talk about "For the Politicians Act."

First, H.R. 1 wants to give American taxpayer dollars to political candidates and campaigns, regardless of whether you support it. We are not talking just Republicans or Democrats running. Any view they want with any impression they want to say.

We just had a bill on the floor yesterday about hate. I imagine there are going to be quite a few people who run for office who get taxpayers' money who talk a lot of hate. I don't think America wants their money spent on that.

This bill will give candidates a government match of 6 to 1, not a dollar for dollar. No, no, no, no. The "For the Politicians Act" multiplies it. So, if a citizen gives \$200, the government gives \$1,200.

That is why the new Democrat socialist party is so excited by this bill. That is why they made it their number one priority. Hard-earned taxpayer money should go toward building roads, bridges, or giving a boost to struggling Americans, not just to political campaigns.

I am not sure about these other districts, but when I campaigned, no one came to me and said: "Let's make sure you take more of my taxpayer money to give to you to run." I can't remember one time anybody on any side of the aisle asked for that.

Worse, this bill would allow political candidates to profit off actually running for office on the American taxpayers' dime. The bill expands the use of taxpayer funds to include the childcare, the rent, the mortgage, or even professional development.

We have now just created a new industry. Think of the individual who just wants to run for office, who wants to spew hate, and says: "The taxpayers are going to pay for it. I am just going to keep doing it."

Second, H.R. 1 legalizes the vote for convicted felons, even if that person was convicted of election fraud. Can you imagine that? We are going to vote on a bill today that provides more taxpayer money to politicians, that is going to allow felons to vote, because we don't care what States say. But even if you are convicted of election fraud, come on down; we have got something special for you.

And this wasn't created by one new member of this Democrat socialist party. It is the most important bill that they selected. It is H.R. 1. No other bill matters to them but this. It just doesn't make sense to me.

Third, H.R. 1 would weaken the security of our elections and make it harder to protect against voter fraud. It automatically registers voters from the DMV.

Voting is a right. It is not a mandate. This legislation would also prevent officials from ever removing ineligible voters from the rolls or even verifying the accuracy of voter information.

To that point, H.R. 1 exposes our election system to widespread fraud. Take ballot harvesting, for example. We have one less Member in this body because of the harvesting of ballots, a practice where a third-party activist can collect your absentee ballot from other voters and turn them in for you, or potentially not even turn them in at all.

Can you imagine putting the trust of your vote in the hand of a stranger? If that doesn't scare you, it should.

Sadly, this practice was weaponized in California and North Carolina not so long ago, but now we want to make it everywhere.

You know, The Washington Post highlighted the peril of this practice. Let me read you the headline: "Don't Be Shocked by the North Carolina Fraud Allegations. Absentee Ballots Are Much Less Secure Than Polling Places."

Absentee ballots are less secure than polling places.

The piece goes on to say: "No one oversees voters filling out absentee ballots to ensure that they fill out the ballot and return it without tampering."

"Campaigns and parties have taken advantage of this by turning to campaign and party workers to deliver and return absentee ballot materials for voters—on the honor system."

And, finally, this bill wants to stack the deck in favor of the party in power at the Federal Election Commission.

We talk a lot about bipartisanship. We have talked a lot about it in different ways. The committee that could only mark up 60 percent of this bill, you might say it is bipartisan. But it is not level. It is six to three. That is why not one of the 28 amendments got adopted.

But the Federal Election Commission is an even six Commissioners, a panel of three on one side and three on the other.

So what does this bill do that the new Democrat socialist majority cares most about? Let's stack the deck. Let's stack the deck a little further. Let's not make it three and three. Let's put the party in power to get that one more, to put the thumb on the scale a little further. So they want to make it a five-member panel.

This week, The New York Times wrote:

Republicans, arguably, have spent more time trying to define this bill than Democrat socialists have spent trying to promote it.

I wonder why. If it is your most important bill, the bill that is going to define your Congress, let's look at what it is. They want to take more taxpayer money. They want to give you less freedom.

Those who vote for it today, I guess they walk away with a raise in their campaign. They are asking the taxpayer to give them 6 to 1. Pretty good return, I would say. But it doesn't even matter if the taxpayer supports you or not because you are just going to make government larger and take the money away.

It is going to let people who are convicted felons open the door. Come on and vote, even if you are convicted of election fraud.

It is kind of interesting to me that you would make it your number one priority. It is kind of interesting to me, a structure of Congress, if you referred to a committee, that you wouldn't have it all marked up. It is kind of interesting to me the only committee you would pick to mark it up is the one chosen by the Speaker. It is interesting to me that this is where you spend your time.

We can do better, and I hope today we have a big voice to say taxpayers should not pay for our elections, that politicians should not vote to take more of taxpayers' hard-earned money so they could say things that people disagree with.

The Acting CHAIR. All Members are reminded to address their remarks to the Chair.

Mr. GOLDEN. Madam Chair, I think I am going to go home this weekend to my district feeling comfortable that I understand what my constituents want.

As I said earlier, in 1996, Maine voters actually voted for a public funding program in the State of Maine. They liked the program so much that they actually upped the ante in 2015 through another voter referendum where Maine voters actually voted that they wanted to continue this program and they wanted to increase the funding to keep regular people competitive against the dark money that was flown into elections in the State of Maine.

In the State of Maine, we actually allow convicted felons to vote. They do it from prison. Because while we be-

lieve in holding people accountable for their crimes, we don't feel the need, in Maine, to take their voice away from them.

So I am going to go home knowing that I understand my district.

I also just want to take a moment—you know, some of the comments from the Republican leader, whom I respect very much, but you want to talk about spewing hate. H.R. 1 is a piece of legislation that Democrats have put forward to show that one of their top priorities is to protect our democracy, and I know a little something about it.

I fought in two wars for this country, in Afghanistan and Iraq, and I reject this socialist rhetoric. I am an American. Democrats are Americans. Republicans are Americans. We need to put this hateful speech behind us and talk about how we can work together.

I understand that there is some frustration being expressed by other side about amendments and whether or not Republicans are involved in this process. Look, I will wrap it up, but let me just say: I have voted for a number of Republican amendments in the last couple of weeks, so I would encourage them to support this amendment.

Madam Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Chair, I thank Mr. GOLDEN for his service to our country. Our country thanks the gentleman, and everyone in this institution thanks him for that service.

This bill, however, is a very bad idea. Public funding of elections is a very bad idea.

At the last second before we vote on H.R. 1, Democrats have decided they are afraid of the CBO score for their massively expensive bill. We haven't even debated it and want to hide it from consideration in this Chamber.

So they created this gimmick called the freedom from influence fund, which is proposed to add an additional 2.75 percent penalty against law-breaking or malfeasant corporations and officials at corporations. They claimed it would generate enough funds to pay the massive cost of funding political campaigns for Members of Congress.

Late last night, we got that CBO report, and the score for H.R. 1 that projects the impact of this new shell game called the freedom from influence fund and its proposed funding source, corporate fines—again, voting for this bill will allow corporate money to, for the first time, lawfully flow into the campaigns of each and every one of us in this institution.

□ 1000

The CBO score tells a very different story from what Democrats want you to believe. According to the CBO, this new fund will result in a reduction of income and payroll taxes, meaning corporations will have less money to spend on their payrolls, which equates to less jobs.

To quote the CBO report:

The assessment on civil monetary penalties and settlements would reduce the base for income and payroll taxes. Consequently, the revenues from the assessments will be partially offset by lower income and payroll taxes.

Put another way, H.R. 1 takes American jobs away in order to fund the campaign coffers of Members of Congress.

Furthermore, the CBO notes that, as a result of this funding source, less money will be available for other government programs that we want to prioritize in this institution.

I quote again from the CBO report:

CBO and JCT expect the increased assessment of criminal and civil penalties would reduce the amount of penalties and settlements collected under current law.

The CBO report confirms what Republicans have been saying all along: H.R. 1 is a shell game that will, in the end, hurt taxpayers because this proposal to publicly fund campaigns will be funded by the taxpayers.

However, you are going to likely hear Democrats say, instead, that this fund will run at a surplus over the first few years of its existence, which is true because they designed the bill to not make any expenditures for the first 6 years of this program.

But pay very close attention. What the Democrats won't tell you is that, once the fund starts making its expenditures, the fund will be nearly broke in 5 years, and that is assuming that the cost of running campaigns will stay static today and not exponentially increase like it has.

Again, this Democratic funding gimmick was concocted just to result in a more desirable CBO score. I don't see that as a result.

The new fund will collect money for 6 years with no expenditures, resulting in the accumulation of a large balance. Then, once the money starts flowing to every Member of Congress in this institution, it is going to run out in 5 years.

Democrats should be ashamed for making this bill H.R. 1.

When Republicans took over this institution, after 50 years in the minority, our H.R. 1 was the Congressional Accountability Act, to make Congress work better.

H.R. 1 in the last Congress, put more money in the pockets of middle-class taxpayers, families back home.

This H.R. 1 will do nothing but put taxpayer dollars in the campaign funds of every Member of Congress, and that is not acceptable to me, and that is why we should have a "no" vote on H.R. 1.

Madam Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Maine (Mr. GOLDEN).

The amendment was agreed to.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments printed in part B of House Report 116–

16 on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendment No. 54 by Mr. BRINDISI of New York.

Amendment No. 7 by Mr. NEGUSE of Colorado.

The Chair will reduce to 2 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote after the first vote in this series.

AMENDMENT NO. 54 OFFERED BY MR. BRINDISI

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. BRINDISI) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 237, noes 188, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 115]

AYES—237

Adams	Deutch	Larsen (WA)
Aguiar	Dingell	Larson (CT)
Allred	Doggett	Lawrence
Axne	Doyle, Michael	Lawson (FL)
Barragán	F.	Lee (CA)
Bass	Engel	Lee (NV)
Beatty	Escobar	Levin (CA)
Bera	Eshoo	Levin (MI)
Beyer	Espallat	Lewis
Bishop (GA)	Evans	Lieu, Ted
Blumenauer	Finkenauer	Lipinski
Blunt Rochester	Fitzpatrick	Loeb
Bonamici	Fletcher	Lofgren
Boyle, Brendan	Foster	Lowenthal
F.	Frankel	Lowe
Brindisi	Fudge	Lujan
Brown (MD)	Gabbard	Luria
Brownley (CA)	Galleo	Lynch
Bustos	Garamendi	Malinowski
Butterfield	Garcia (IL)	Maloney
Carbajal	Garcia (TX)	Carolyn B.
Cárdenas	Golden	Maloney, Sean
Cartson (IN)	Gomez	Matsui
Cartwright	Gonzalez (TX)	McAdams
Case	Gottheimer	McBath
Casten (IL)	Green (TX)	McCollum
Castor (FL)	Grijalva	McEachin
Castro (TX)	Haaland	McGovern
Chu, Judy	Harder (CA)	McNerney
Cicilline	Hastings	Meeks
Cisneros	Hayes	Meng
Clark (MA)	Heck	Moore
Clarke (NY)	Higgins (NY)	Morelle
Cleaver	Hill (CA)	Moulton
Clyburn	Himes	Mucarsel-Powell
Cohen	Horn, Kendra S.	Murphy
Connolly	Horsford	Nadler
Cooper	Houlahan	Napolitano
Correa	Hoyer	Neal
Costa	Huffman	Neguse
Courtney	Jackson Lee	Norcross
Cox (CA)	Jayapal	Norton
Craig	Jeffries	O'Halleran
Crist	Johnson (GA)	Ocasio-Cortez
Crow	Johnson (TX)	Omar
Cuellar	Kaptur	Pallone
Cummings	Katko	Panetta
Cunningham	Keating	Pappas
Davis (KS)	Kelly (IL)	Pascarella
Davis (CA)	Kennedy	Payne
Davis, Danny K.	Kildee	Perlmutter
Dean	Kilmer	Peters
DeFazio	Kim	Peterson
DeGette	Kind	Phillips
DeLauro	Kirkpatrick	Pingree
DeBene	Krishnamoorthi	Plaskett
Delgado	Kuster (NH)	Pocan
Demings	Lamb	Porter
DeSaulnier	Langevin	Pressley

Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Rose (NY)
Rouda
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Scanlon
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schrier
Scott (VA)
Scott, David

Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shalala
Sherman
Sherrill
Sires
Slotkin
Smith (WA)
Soto
Spanberger
Speier
Stanton
Stefanik
Stevens
Suozi
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tlaib
Tonko

Torres (CA)
Torres Small
(NM)
Trahan
Trone
Underwood
Van Drew
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wexton
Wild
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOES—188

Abraham	Gooden	Norman
Aderholt	Gosar	Nunes
Allen	Granger	Olson
Amash	Graves (GA)	Palazzo
Amodei	Graves (LA)	Palmer
Armstrong	Graves (MO)	Pence
Arrington	Green (TN)	Perry
Babin	Griffith	Posey
Bacon	Grothman	Ratcliffe
Baird	Guest	Reed
Balderson	Guthrie	Reschenthaler
Banks	Hagedorn	Rice (SC)
Barr	Harris	Riggleman
Bergman	Hartzler	Roby
Biggs	Hern, Kevin	Rodgers (WA)
Bishop (UT)	Herrera Beutler	Roe, David P.
Bost	Hice (GA)	Rogers (KY)
Brady	Higgins (LA)	Rooney (FL)
Brooks (AL)	Hill (AR)	Rose, John W.
Brooks (IN)	Holding	Rouzer
Buchanan	Hollingsworth	Roy
Buck	Hudson	Rutherford
Bucshon	Huizenga	Scalise
Budd	Hunter	Schweikert
Burchett	Hurd (TX)	Scott, Austin
Burgess	Johnson (LA)	Sensenbrenner
Byrne	Johnson (OH)	Shimkus
Calvert	Johnson (SD)	Simpson
Carter (GA)	Jordan	Smith (MO)
Carter (TX)	Joyce (OH)	Smith (NE)
Chabot	Joyce (PA)	Smith (NJ)
Cheney	Kelly (MS)	Smucker
Cline	Kelly (PA)	Spano
Cloud	King (IA)	Stauber
Cole	King (NY)	Steil
Collins (GA)	Kinzing	Steube
Collins (NY)	Kustoff (TN)	Stewart
Comer	LaHood	Taylor
Conaway	LaMalfa	Thompson (PA)
Cook	Lamborn	Thornberry
Crenshaw	Latta	Timmons
Davidson (OH)	Lesko	Tipton
Davis, Rodney	Long	Turner
DesJarlais	Loudermilk	Upton
Diaz-Balart	Lucas	Wagner
Duffy	Luetkemeyer	Walberg
Duncan	Marchant	Walden
Emmer	Marshall	Walker
Estes	Massie	Walorski
Ferguson	Mast	Waltz
Fleischmann	McCarthy	Watkins
Flores	McCaul	Weber (TX)
Fortenberry	McClintock	Webster (FL)
Foxx (NC)	McHenry	Wenstrup
Fulcher	McKinley	Westerman
Gaetz	Meadows	Williams
Gallagher	Meuser	Wilson (SC)
Gianforte	Miller	Wittman
Gibbs	Mitchell	Womack
Gohmert	Moolenaar	Woodall
Gonzalez (OH)	Mooney (WV)	Wright
González-Colón	Mullin	Young
(PR)	Newhouse	Zeldin

NOT VOTING—12

□ 1027

So the amendment was agreed to.
The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. KHANNA. Madam Chair, I was late with my kids sick. Had I been present, I would have voted “yea” on rollcall No. 115.

Stated against:

Mr. YOHO. Madam Chair, had I been present, I would have voted “nay” on rollcall No. 115.

Mr. CURTIS. Madam Chair, had I been present, I would have voted “nay” on rollcall No. 115.

AMENDMENT NO. 70 OFFERED BY MR. NEGUSE

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. NEGUSE) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 239, noes 186, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 116]

AYES—239

Adams	Dean	Kaptur
Aguilar	DeFazio	Keating
Allred	DeGette	Kelly (IL)
Axne	DeLauro	Kennedy
Barragán	DelBene	Khanna
Bass	Delgado	Kildee
Beatty	Demings	Kilmer
Bera	DeSaulnier	Kim
Beyer	Deutch	Kind
Bishop (GA)	Dingell	Kirkpatrick
Bishop (UT)	Doggett	Krishnamoorthi
Blumenauer	Doyle, Michael	Kuster (NH)
Blunt Rochester	F.	Lamb
Bonamici	Engel	Langevin
Bost	Escobar	Larsen (WA)
Boyle, Brendan	Eshoo	Larson (CT)
F.	Españillat	Lawrence
Brady	Evans	Lawson (FL)
Brindisi	Finkenaue	Lee (CA)
Brown (MD)	Fitzpatrick	Lee (NV)
Brownley (CA)	Fletcher	Levin (CA)
Buck	Foster	Levin (MI)
Bustos	Frankel	Lewis
Butterfield	Fudge	Lieu, Ted
Carbajal	Gabbard	Lipinski
Cárdenas	Gallego	Loeb
Carson (IN)	Garamendi	Loftgren
Cartwright	Garcia (IL)	Lowenthal
Case	Garcia (TX)	Lowe
Casten (IL)	Golden	Lujan
Castor (FL)	Gomez	Luria
Castro (TX)	Gonzalez (TX)	Lynch
Chu, Judy	Gonzalez-Colón	Malinowski
Cisneros	(PR)	Maloney,
Clark (MA)	Gottheimer	Carolyn B.
Clarke (NY)	Green (TX)	Matsui
Cleaver	Grijalva	McAdams
Clyburn	Haaland	McBath
Cohen	Harder (CA)	McCollum
Connolly	Hastings	McEachin
Cooper	Hayes	McGovern
Correa	Heck	McNerney
Costa	Higgins (NY)	Meeks
Courtney	Hill (CA)	Meng
Cox (CA)	Himes	Moore
Craig	Horn, Kendra S.	Morelle
Crist	Horsford	Moulton
Crow	Houlahan	Mucarsel-Powell
Cuellar	Hoyer	Murphy
Cummings	Huffman	Nadler
Cunningham	Jackson Lee	Napolitano
Davids (KS)	Jayapal	Neal
Davis (CA)	Jeffries	Neguse
Davis, Danny K.	Johnson (TX)	Norcross

Norton
O'Halleran
Ocasio-Cortez
Omar
Pallone
Panetta
Pappas
Pascarell
Payne
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Phillips
Pingree
Plaskett
Pocan
Porter
Pressley
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Rose (NY)
Rouda
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Scanlon
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schrier
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shalala
Sherman
Sherrill
Sires
Slotkin
Smith (WA)
Soto
Spanberger
Speier
Stanton
Staubert
Stevens
Suozzi
Swalwell (CA)

NOES—186

Abraham	Graves (GA)	Nunes
Aderholt	Graves (LA)	Olson
Allen	Graves (MO)	Palazzo
Amash	Green (TN)	Palmer
Amodei	Griffith	Pence
Armstrong	Grothman	Perry
Arrington	Guest	Posey
Babin	Guthrie	Ratcliffe
Bacon	Hagedorn	Reed
Baird	Harris	Reschenthaler
Balderson	Hartzer	Rice (SC)
Banks	Hern, Kevin	Riggleman
Barr	Herrera Beutler	Roby
Bergman	Hice (GA)	Rodgers (WA)
Biggs	Higgins (LA)	Roe, David P.
Bilirakis	Hill (AR)	Rogers (KY)
Brooks (AL)	Holding	Rooney (FL)
Brooks (IN)	Hollingsworth	Rose, John W.
Buchanan	Hudson	Rouzer
Bucshon	Huizenga	Roy
Budd	Hunter	Rutherford
Burchett	Hurd (TX)	Scalise
Burgess	Johnson (LA)	Schweikert
Byrne	Johnson (OH)	Scott, Austin
Calvert	Johnson (SD)	Sensenbrenner
Carter (GA)	Jordan	Shimkus
Carter (TX)	Joyce (OH)	Simpson
Chabot	Joyce (PA)	Smith (MO)
Cheney	Katko	Smith (NE)
Cline	Kelly (MS)	Smith (NJ)
Cloud	Kelly (PA)	Smucker
Cole	King (IA)	Spano
Collins (GA)	King (NY)	Stefanik
Collins (NY)	Kinzing	Steil
Comer	Kustoff (TN)	Steube
Conaway	LaHood	Stewart
Cook	LaMalfa	Taylor
Crenshaw	Lamborn	Thompson (PA)
Curtis	Latta	Thornberry
Davidson (OH)	Lesko	Timmons
Davis, Rodney	Long	Tipton
DesJarlais	Loudermilk	Turner
Diaz-Balart	Lucas	Wagner
Duffy	Luetkemeyer	Walberg
Duncan	Marchant	Walden
Emmer	Marshall	Walker
Estes	Massie	Walorski
Ferguson	Mast	Waltz
Fleischmann	McCarthy	Watkins
Flores	McCaul	Weber (TX)
Fortenberry	McClintock	Webster (FL)
Fox (NC)	McHenry	Wenstrup
Fulcher	McKinley	Westerman
Gaetz	Meadows	Williams
Gallagher	Meuser	Wilson (SC)
Gianforte	Miller	Wittman
Gibbs	Mitchell	Womack
Gohmert	Moolenaar	Woodall
Gonzalez (OH)	Mooney (WV)	Wright
Gooden	Mullin	Yoho
Gosar	Newhouse	Young
Granger	Norman	Zeldin

NOT VOTING—12

Cicilline	Johnson (GA)	Sablan
Clay	Maloney, Sean	San Nicolas
Crawford	Radewagen	Stivers
Dunn	Rogers (AL)	Van Drew

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1033

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. VAN DREW. Madam Chair, had I been present, I would have voted “yea” on rollcall No. 116.

Stated against:

Mr. BOST. Madam Chair, on rollcall Number 116, my vote is recorded as “yea.” My intention was to vote “nay.”

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to the rule, it is now in order to consider a final period of general debate which shall not exceed 10 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chair and the ranking minority member of the Committee on House Administration.

The gentlewoman from California (Ms. LOFGREN) and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RODNEY DAVIS) each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California.

Ms. LOFGREN. Madam Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Chair, for 8 years, this Chamber has been silent, a silence that harms people. We have allowed measures to reduce people's access to vote, measures that caused the Fourth Circuit to find that African American voters were targeted with surgical precision, measures that excluded voters on Indian reservations and that wrongfully tried to remove 95,000 naturalized Texans from the rolls.

Today that silence ends. This bill is not for its own sake. A Member of the U.S. Senate said that H.R. 1 is a power grab. He is right. It grabs power away from the special interests, the elites, and the 1 percent and gives it to the American people.

I tell you plainly what it does: automatic voter registration to allow 50 million eligible citizens to vote, prohibits deceptive practices, increases access to polls for voters with disabilities, helps States replace outdated voting machines, and requires disclosure of dark money donors, not limiting their speech but simply asking them to stand by it. These reforms aren't difficult, but they will require courage to make.

Mr. Frederick Douglass saw what our democracy was and what our democracy could be and said: “Where all is plain there is nothing to be argued.”

For that reason, I do not argue. But I look forward to joining and doing the will of the people and supporting this bill.

I reserve the balance of my time, Madam Chair.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (Ms. HAALAND). The Chair will remind all persons in the gallery that they are here as guests of the House and that any manifestation of approval or disapproval of proceedings is in violation of the rules of the House.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Chair, before I get started, I ask for a point of personal privilege to have the Members of this institution and the gallery recognize the Chair as the first Native American woman to ever chair the House proceedings.

The Acting CHAIR. The Chair thanks the gentleman from Illinois.

The gentleman from Illinois is recognized.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Chair, as my home State President Ronald Reagan once said: 'The most terrifying words in the English language are: "I'm from the government and I'm here to help."'

I am for the American voter. I support every eligible voter having easier ways to register to vote and easier access to the polls. What I am not for is Washington, D.C. taking over our elections.

I have said it before: I agree with my colleagues across the aisle that there is a role for the Federal Government to play in election infrastructure, campaign finance disclosure, ballot access, transparency, and, most importantly, election security. However, H.R. 1, misuses taxpayer dollars, takes power away from the States to administer their own elections, and threatens to limit Americans' constitutional rights. I cannot support this legislation.

This bill, a 700-page mammoth bill, takes power away from States given to them by the U.S. Constitution to designate the time, place, and the manner of their elections. I know the author of this legislation said yesterday that H.R. 1 is simply implementing the best practices of States, but that is federalizing our election system, no matter how nicely you phrase it.

Congress should partner with the States who understand the unique needs of their own residents and provide support to increase voter registration and improve election security instead of federally mandating, what this bill does, which is a one-size-fits-all approach.

There is a limited role for the Federal Government to play in elections when patterns of discrimination have occurred, and when we will continue to address those patterns, we can do it in a bipartisan way through the Voting Rights Act.

I cannot stress enough that Congress should absolutely be in favor of increasing access to the polls, but we cannot do that without adding the necessary checks and balances to ensure that these accesses are protected.

We should allow States to maintain their own voter rolls to help them process voters in a timely manner, avoid unfunded mandates, and manage voter lists to avoid registration and voting irregularities. A few voting irregularities can change the outcome of a single election.

Just look at what happened recently in North Carolina. A political operative working for a Republican candidate illegally harvested ballots which led to

the North Carolina State Board of Elections calling for a new special election. Ballot harvesting is the practice when a political operative or volunteer can come to your home, pick up your ballot, and deliver it to the polling precinct. This process, while illegal in most States like North Carolina, is a perfectly legal practice in places like California.

Republicans, both at the House Administration Committee markup and at Rules Committee, offered amendments to prohibit ballot harvesting, and both attempts were rejected by Democrats. We can no longer be naive to think that this is a practice that will simply help your elderly neighbor who can no longer get to the polls. Just ask my former colleagues from California. Ballot harvesting is an unguarded instrument that is occurring on a large scale as a practice used by political operatives to manipulate the outcome of elections.

If we want to improve election security, we must eliminate ballot harvesting and its risks to taking away the choice of the American people. Every American deserves their vote to be counted and protected.

H.R. 1 limits free speech and imposes vague standards that disadvantage American citizens who want to advocate on behalf of what they believe in. Organizations like the National Right to Life, the Chamber of Commerce, and even the ACLU have spoken out against this bill for that very reason. Every American should be able to speak on an issue that they are passionate about.

We also recently received the revised CBO score of H.R. 1 which egregiously underestimated H.R. 1's cost to the taxpayers because the Congressional Budget Office said they needed more time to develop a comprehensive score. Instead of giving them more time, we are preparing right now to vote on this 700-page bill.

My colleagues across the aisle are all about transparency—at least that is what I keep hearing. But I have yet to see it in action, especially when it comes to funding their own campaigns. H.R. 1 is creating public subsidies through the new government match program. For every \$200, \$1,200 will be going to a politician's campaign. The majority has changed this provision so many times throughout the last couple weeks. This money will come from the U.S. Treasury through corporate fines and go into this nebulous Freedom From Influence Fund, but the bottom line is it is going into Members of Congress' own campaigns.

Why are we allocating money to go to politicians when there are so many other causes like transportation, infrastructure, and cancer research that our tax dollars, your tax dollars, and the Americans' tax dollars should be funding?

□ 1045

The Democratic majority claims they want to take money out of poli-

tics but have created a scheme that will, for the first time ever, make it legal for Members of Congress to take corporate money into their own campaigns.

This is exactly why we need to vote "no" on H.R. 1. It is a travesty.

Madam Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. LOFGREN. Madam Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. SARBANES), leader of H.R. 1, the author of the bill.

Mr. SARBANES. Madam Chair, my colleagues, somewhere in America there is a family in their living room looking at the television, hearing another report about how billionaires and super-PACs and insiders and lobbyists are running Washington and calling the shots on what happens in their lives.

And they are asking themselves: Do we matter anymore? Do we count? Will our voice be heard?

H.R. 1 says to that family and millions of families across the country who feel the same way: We get it. We hear you. We want to change this place and give you your voice back by restoring ethics and integrity, by pushing back on the influence of big money in our politics and by making sure that, when you go to vote, you don't have to run an obstacle course to the ballot box in America.

That is what we stand for.

Our colleague JOHN LEWIS reminds us all the time that we have to keep our eyes on the prize. Well, on this day, at this moment, in this House, the prize is H.R. 1. Let's pass H.R. 1.

Ms. LOFGREN. Madam Chair, may I inquire how much time remains.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from California has 2½ minutes remaining.

Ms. LOFGREN. Madam Chair, I yield the remainder of my time to the gentleman from Georgia, the Honorable JOHN LEWIS, hero of the voting rights and civil rights movement.

Mr. LEWIS. Madam Chair, I rise in strong support on H.R. 1, and I urge each and every one of our colleagues to support this bill.

Madam Chair, you have heard me say on occasion that the right to vote is precious—almost sacred. In a democratic society, it the most powerful nonviolent instrument or tool that we have.

In my heart of hearts, I believe we have a moral responsibility to restore access for all of our citizens who desire to participate in the democratic process.

Many people marched and protested for the right to vote. Some gave a little blood. Others gave their very lives.

This weekend, many of our colleagues traveled with us to Alabama—to Birmingham, to Montgomery, and to Selma. They saw the signs in the museums that said, "White only." "Colored only."

They visited the First Baptist Church in downtown Montgomery

where we feared for our lives as a mob waited outside to attack and kill us.

They stood on the Edmund Pettus Bridge—crossing the Alabama River—where we were beaten, trampled, and tear-gassed for attempting to march from Selma to Montgomery to dramatize the need for voting rights.

Madam Chair, you have heard me tell this story before, and you know our work is not finished. It makes me sad. It makes me feel like crying when people are denied the right to vote.

We all know that this is not a Democratic or a Republican issue. It is an American one.

For the past few days, I listened to the debate on this bill. I spent some time having what I call an executive session with myself.

The words of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., came to mind. He would often say that the “arc of the moral universe is long, but it bends toward justice.”

This vote is an opportunity to be on the right side of history. It is a chance to cast a vote by the people, of the people, and for the people.

So I ask you: If not us, then who? If not now, then when?

The time has arrived to tear down the barriers to the ballot box. Today, we are able to do our part in this long fight for the very soul of our Nation. Let's save our Nation and redeem the soul of America.

Ms. LOFGREN. I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. All time for general debate has expired.

Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Ms. DEGETTE) having assumed the chair, Ms. HAALAND, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 1) to expand Americans' access to the ballot box, reduce the influence of big money in politics, and strengthen ethics rules for public servants, and for other purposes, and, pursuant to House Resolution 172, she reported the bill, as amended by that resolution, back to the House with sundry further amendments adopted in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any further amendment reported from the Committee of the Whole? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. CRENSHAW. Madam Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. CRENSHAW. I am, in its current form.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Crenshaw moves to recommit the bill H.R. 1 to the Committee on the Judiciary with instructions to report the same to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

Add, at the end of the bill, the following (and conform the table of contents accordingly):

DIVISION D—UPHOLDING SUFFRAGE IN AMERICA

TITLE XI—UPHOLDING SUFFRAGE IN AMERICA

SEC. 11001. SHORT TITLE.

This division may be cited as the “Upholding Suffrage in America Act” or the “USA Act”.

SEC. 11002. FINDINGS.

Congress finds as follows:

(1) Voting is fundamental to a functioning democracy.

(2) The Constitution prohibits discrimination in voting based on race, sex, poll taxes, and age.

(3) It is of paramount importance that the United States maintains the legitimacy of its elections and protects them from interference, including interference from foreign threats and illegal voting.

(4) The city of San Francisco, California, is allowing non-citizens, including illegal immigrants, to register to vote in school board elections.

(5) Federal law prohibits non-citizens from voting in elections for Federal office.

SEC. 11003. SENSE OF CONGRESS.

It is the sense of Congress that allowing illegal immigrants the right to vote devalues the franchise and diminishes the voting power of United States citizens.

Ms. LOFGREN (during the reading). Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the reading be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. I object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Objection is heard.

The Clerk will continue to read.

The Clerk continued to read.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CRENSHAW. Madam Speaker, this is the final amendment to the bill. It will not kill the bill. If adopted, the bill will immediately proceed to final passage, as amended.

Much has been made of election security as of late, much of it for good reason. In the end, these concerns, the concerns that many Americans rightfully share, are built around the fundamental notion that our vote should count, our vote should mean something; and we should know that, when we cast it, it is sacred and unchanging.

Our vote is a signal of what direction we want our country to move toward, and that vote is an element of trust that we place in the men or women elected to take it in that direction.

We vote because this country is governed by the people, by the citizens of

this country. We in this body humbly serve at their pleasure.

The quickest way to erode a democracy, erode faith in our institutions, is to erode that trust, erode the notion that your vote truly counts.

The truth is this is already happening. In places like San Francisco, Democrats have fought hard to ensure that U.S. citizens must share their civic duty, their vote, with illegal immigrants. The city of San Francisco has effectively canceled out the votes of its citizens and replaced it with illegals.

When I say it out loud, it sounds like I am making it up, because what kind of government would cancel out the votes of its own citizens and replace them with noncitizens—but not just any noncitizens, ones who entered our country illegally.

It is with this in mind, this sacred duty to protect our citizens, protect their vote, protect their voice, that I propose this motion to recommit.

This motion to recommit would show the American people that, despite the deep and growing differences between us, we can at least agree that the people who vote for us are citizens of this country.

Madam Speaker, this is a simple affirmation. It is an affirmation of the fact that the elected representatives of this body answer to the citizens of this country who voted for us. We will not stand by and let their voices be muted. We will not let their trust be eroded. We will not let our democracy be questioned.

Last year, Congress voted on this very idea. Forty-nine Democrats crossed the aisle to vote with us.

It should not be a partisan idea that the people who do not legally live in our country cannot legally vote in our elections. If you are not legally here, if you entered our country against the laws and wishes of our citizens, then you should not vote for representation in our government, diluting the voices of Americans.

I am proposing this MTR not because it feels good, not because we want to attack anyone, but because it is clear to all of us that voter integrity actually needs to be defended.

It has become clear because San Francisco is not the only municipality that has fallen into this radicalism. Other cities have done or attempted to do the same.

The men and women in this body are here because we were duly elected as such.

Our citizens expect much of us. They expect us to protect their most fundamental rights: the right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. They expect us to respect their voice. Often, the only way they have to express that voice is through their vote.

If we no longer agree to protect that voice, as we did last Congress—if we don't, in this moment, agree that their voice should not be canceled out but protected, then I worry a great deal

about our democracy. I worry that radicalism has made its way into this sacred body, as it already has in so many other places across our great country.

I urge my colleagues to vote for this motion to recommit. Vote to protect the voices of your constituents. Vote to preserve the notion that our Nation's government is elected by—and only by—the citizens of this country. Anything less is a disservice to the very people who put us here.

Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1100

Ms. LOFGREN. Madam Speaker, I claim the time in opposition.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. LOFGREN. Madam Speaker, H.R. 1 already prevents noncitizens from voting in Federal elections, whether they are here lawfully or undocumented. In fact, the motion to recommit notices that. They say: "Federal law prohibits noncitizens from voting in Federal elections."

H.R. 1 utilizes the authority in Article I, Section 4 to extend in Federal elections the opportunity for every American to vote.

This motion to recommit is an effort to divert us from the mission that we are on to expand voting rights to every American citizen in Federal elections. I urge its defeat.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. ROSE).

Mr. ROSE of New York. Madam Speaker, I rise today in opposition to this motion. I rise today as a new Member who ran for office on cleaning up our system. And admittedly, I rise today as someone who has voted for Republican MTRs in the past.

In fact, I was eager to hear how my colleagues and friends across the aisle would propose a solution today for how they are going to finally drain the swamp. I was eager to hear how they would protect and enshrine the rights and freedoms and liberties that we all are endowed in the Constitution.

But what they have given us today does nothing to drain the swamp, nothing to uphold our freedoms. Only in Washington would we see a group of people actively trying to sabotage anticorruption measures.

This is a political stunt meant to divide us, meant to sow hatred. It is a game, nothing less. Nothing less.

This right here is why the American people hate politics. Honestly, if this is your strategy to win future elections, we wish you Godspeed because it will never work. It will never work because the question before us today, and the thing that this joke of an MTR that is seeking to distract us from is, whose side are you on?

Let's show the American people that this is the people's House, not the House of corporate interests and lobbyists and dark money.

Again, I stand in opposition to this motion.

Ms. LOFGREN. Madam Speaker, may I ask how much time remains.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from California has 2½ minutes remaining.

Ms. LOFGREN. At this point, Madam Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LEWIS), the hero of the voting rights movement.

Mr. LEWIS. Madam Speaker, I believe in the way of peace, in the way of love. I believe in the philosophy and the discipline of nonviolence.

Can we come together and support a simple piece of legislation to open up the political process and let all of our people come in?

I ask you to remember what I said a few moments ago. With this vote, we have an opportunity to be a headlight and not a taillight.

Some of our colleagues are complaining that we didn't have enough time. We have the time. This piece of legislation was introduced more than 7 years ago, and the other party didn't do anything.

We are prepared to act. We are prepared to open up the political process and let all of the people come in. It is the right thing to do. It is a good thing to do, to set our country on a path, a path that can be a model for the rest of the world.

Ms. LOFGREN. Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, this 5-minute vote on the motion to recommit will be followed by 5-minute votes on:

Passage of the bill, if ordered; and Agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal, if ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 197, nays 228, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 117]

YEAS—197

Abraham	Bishop (UT)	Carter (TX)
Aderholt	Bost	Chabot
Allen	Brady	Cheney
Amodei	Brindisi	Cline
Armstrong	Brooks (AL)	Cloud
Arrington	Brooks (IN)	Cole
Babin	Buchanan	Collins (GA)
Bacon	Buck	Collins (NY)
Baird	Bucshon	Comer
Balderson	Budd	Conaway
Banks	Burchett	Cook
Barr	Burgess	Crenshaw
Bergman	Byrne	Cunningham
Biggs	Calvert	Curtis
Billirakis	Carter (GA)	Davidson (OH)

Davis, Rodney	Joyce (PA)	Rooney (FL)
DesJarlais	Katko	Rose, John W.
Diaz-Balart	Kelly (MS)	Rouzer
Duffy	Kelly (PA)	Roy
Duncan	King (IA)	Rutherford
Emmer	King (NY)	Scalise
Estes	Kininger	Schrader
Ferguson	Kustoff (TN)	Schweikert
Fitzpatrick	LaHood	Scott, Austin
Fleischmann	LaMalfa	Sensenbrenner
Flores	Lamborn	Shimkus
Fortenberry	Latta	Simpson
Fox (NC)	Lesko	Smith (MO)
Fulcher	Long	Smith (NE)
Gaetz	Loudermilk	Smith (NJ)
Gallagher	Lucas	Smucker
Gianforte	Luetkemeyer	Spano
Gibbs	Marchant	Staubert
Gohmert	Marshall	Stefanik
Gonzalez (OH)	Massie	Steil
Gooden	Mast	Steube
Gosar	McBath	Stewart
Granger	McCarthy	Taylor
Graves (GA)	McCaul	Thompson (PA)
Graves (LA)	McClintock	Thornberry
Graves (MO)	McHenry	Timmons
Green (TN)	McKinley	Tipton
Griffith	Meadows	Turner
Grothman	Meuser	Upton
Guest	Miller	Van Drew
Guthrie	Mitchell	Wagner
Hagedorn	Moolenaar	Walberg
Harris	Mooney (WV)	Walden
Hartzler	Mullin	Walker
Hern, Kevin	Newhouse	Walorski
Herrera Beutler	Norman	Waltz
Hice (GA)	Nunes	Watkins
Higgins (LA)	Olson	Weber (TX)
Hill (AR)	Palazzo	Webster (FL)
Holding	Palmer	Wenstrup
Hollingsworth	Pence	Westerman
Horn, Kendra S.	Perry	Williams
Hudson	Posey	Wilson (SC)
Huizenga	Ratcliffe	Wittman
Hunter	Reed	Womack
Hurd (TX)	Reschenthaler	Woodall
Johnson (LA)	Rice (SC)	Wright
Johnson (OH)	Riggleman	Yoho
Johnson (SD)	Roby	Young
Jordan	Roe, David P.	Zeldin
Joyce (OH)	Rogers (KY)	

NAYS—228

Adams	Cummings	Horsford
Aguilar	Davids (KS)	Houlahan
Allred	Davis (CA)	Hoyer
Amash	Davis, Danny K.	Huffman
Axne	Dean	Jackson Lee
Barragán	DeFazio	Jayapal
Bass	DeGette	Jeffries
Beatty	DeLauro	Johnson (GA)
Bera	DelBene	Johnson (TX)
Beyer	Delgado	Kaptur
Bishop (GA)	Demings	Keating
Blumenauer	DeSaulnier	Kelly (IL)
Blunt Rochester	Deutch	Kennedy
Bonamici	Dingell	Khanna
Boyle, Brendan	Doggett	Kildee
F.	Doyle, Michael	Kilmer
Brown (MD)	F.	Kim
Brownley (CA)	Engel	Kind
Bustos	Escobar	Kirkpatrick
Butterfield	Eshoo	Krishnamoorthi
Carbajal	Espallat	Kuster (NH)
Cárdenas	Evans	Lamb
Carson (IN)	Finkenauer	Langevin
Cartwright	Fletcher	Larsen (WA)
Case	Foster	Larson (CT)
Casten (IL)	Frankel	Lawrence
Castor (FL)	Fudge	Lawson (FL)
Castro (TX)	Gabbard	Lee (CA)
Chu, Judy	Gallego	Lee (NV)
Cicilline	Garamendi	Levin (CA)
Cisneros	Garcia (IL)	Levin (MI)
Clark (MA)	Garcia (TX)	Lewis
Clarke (NY)	Golden	Lieu, Ted
Cleaver	Gomez	Lipinski
Clyburn	Gonzalez (TX)	Loeb sack
Cohen	Gottheimer	Lofgren
Connolly	Green (TX)	Lowenthal
Cooper	Grijalva	Lowe y
Correa	Haaland	Lujan
Costa	Harder (CA)	Luria
Courtney	Hastings	Lynch
Cox (CA)	Hayes	Malinowski
Craig	Heck	Maloney
Crist	Higgins (NY)	Carolyn B.
Crow	Hill (CA)	Matsui
Cuellar	Himes	McAdams

McCollum Pressley
McEachin Price (NC)
McGovern Quigley
McNerney Raskin
Meeks Rice (NY)
Meng Richmond
Moore Rose (NY)
Morelle Rouda
Moulton Roybal-Allard
Mucarsel-Powell Ruiz
Murphy Ruppertsberger
Nadler Rush
Napolitano Ryan
Neal Sanchez
Neguse Sarbanes
Norcross Scanlon
O'Halleran Schakowsky
Ocasio-Cortez Schiff
Omar Schneider
Pallone Schrier
Panetta Scott (VA)
Pappas Scott, David
Pascrell Serrano
Payne Sewell (AL)
Pelosi Shalala
Perlmutter Sherman
Peters Sherrill
Peterson Sires
Phillips Slotkin
Pingree Smith (WA)
Pocan Soto
Porter Spanberger

NOT VOTING—7

Clay Malone, Sean
Crawford Rodgers (WA)
Dunn Rogers (AL)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1111

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mrs. RODGERS of Washington. Madam Speaker, had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on rollcall No. 117.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 234, nays 193, not voting 5, as follows:

[Roll No. 118]

YEAS—234

Adams Carson (IN)
Aguilar Cartwright
Allred Case
Axne Casten (IL)
Barragán Castor (FL)
Bass Castro (TX)
Beatty Chu, Judy
Bera Cicilline
Beyer Cisneros
Bishop (GA) Clark (MA)
Blumenauer Clarke (NY)
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici Cleaver
Boyle, Brendan Clyburn
F. Cohen
Brindisi Connolly
Brown (MD) Cooper
Brownley (CA) Correa
Bustos Costa
Butterfield Courtney
Carbajal Cox (CA)
Cárdenas Crist

Crow Cuellar
Cummings
Cunningham
Davids (KS)
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny K.
Dean
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
DeBene
Delgado
Demings
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael
F.
Engel
Escobar

Eshoo
Espallat
Evans
Finkenauer
Fletcher
Foster
Frankel
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia (IL)
Garcia (TX)
Golden
Gomez
Gonzalez (TX)
Gottheimer
Green (TX)
Grijalva
Haaland
Harder (CA)
Hastings
Hayes
Heck
Higgins (NY)
Hill (CA)
Himes
Horn, Kendra S.
Horsford
Houlahan
Hoyer
Huffman
Jackson Lee
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (TX)
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Khanna
Kildee
Kilmer
Kim
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster (NH)
Lamb
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee (CA)
Lee (NV)
Levin (CA)

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Armstrong
Arrington
Babin
Bacon
Baird
Balderson
Banks
Barr
Bergman
Biggs
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Bost
Brady
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Budd
Burchett
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Cheney
Cline
Cloud
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comer

NAYS—193

Conaway
Cook
Crenshaw
Curtis
Davidson (OH)
Davis, Rodney
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan
Emmer
Estes
Ferguson
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Flores
Fortenberry
Fox (NC)
Fulcher
Gaetz
Gallagher
Gianforte
Gibbs
Gohmert
Gonzalez (OH)
Gooden
Gosar
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green (TN)
Griffith
Grothman
Guest
Guthrie
Hagedorn
Harris
Hartzler

McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
Meadows
Meuser
Miller
Mitchell
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Newhouse
Norman
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Pence
Perry
Posey
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reschenthaler
Rice (SC)
Riggleman
Roby
Rodgers (WA)

Clay Dunn
Crawford Rogers (AL)

NOT VOTING—5

□ 1121

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will remind all persons in the gallery that they are here as guests of the House and that any manifestation of approval or disapproval of proceedings is in violation of the rules of the House.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the question on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal, which the Chair will put de novo.

The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

REQUEST TO CONSIDER H.R. 962, BORN-ALIVE ABORTION SURVIVORS PROTECTION ACT

Mrs. MILLER. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be discharged from further consideration of H.R. 962, the Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under guidelines consistently issued by successive Speakers, as recorded in section 956 of the House Rules and Manual, the Chair is constrained not to entertain this request unless it has been cleared by the bipartisan floor and committee leaderships.

Mrs. MILLER. Madam Speaker, if this unanimous consent request cannot be entertained, I urge the Speaker and

the majority leader to immediately schedule this bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman is not recognized for debate.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

(Mr. SCALISE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), the House majority leader, for the purpose of explaining the week to come.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

As I have expressed, the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. RICHMOND), my friend, would like to have a moment.

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. RICHMOND).

Mr. RICHMOND. Mr. Speaker, I thank both the majority leader and the minority whip for yielding me time.

Today is a great day, but it is also a sad day for me. I am losing my chief of staff, the only one that I have had since I have been here, Virgil Miller, who, the funny story is, John Dingell made the reference for me to hire him.

The one thing I appreciate now is that when I called John Dingell for a recommendation, he was on the House floor, but told his staff, "No matter where I am, pull me off so I can talk about how great Virgil Miller is."

Some of you may have seen the news, but Virgil proposed. More importantly, Kirby said yes. So he is getting married and starting another chapter of his life.

It was great to have him here in this body, and I hope for him the best. He is not only my chief, but he has come to be part of our family and like a younger brother to me. I just want to wish him the best as he goes off to start a more exciting part of his life and wish him the best.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the majority leader for allowing me to say a few words.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his comments.

I know that I speak on behalf of all the Members of the House to wish Virgil Godspeed, great success in the future, and great happiness.

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, if I may reclaim my time from the majority leader.

Mr. Speaker, I do also want to thank Virgil for his time and his service to the House for so long and to work so closely with my friend, CEDRIC RICHMOND, but also with the entire Louisiana delegation. We have had a long history of working incredibly well together on issues that are important to our State and the country.

Virgil has been right there from the beginning of CEDRIC's career and a great part of the Louisiana delegation but also a great part of what makes this House work.

Mr. Speaker, while we will miss Virgil, I wish him well on his new life ahead, a lot of exciting times. I continue to look forward to seeing you in New Orleans at our great restaurants.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER).

□ 1130

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, on Monday, the House will meet at 12 p.m. for morning-hour debate and 2 p.m. for legislative business, with votes postponed until 6:30 p.m.

On Tuesday and Wednesday, the House will meet at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate and 12 p.m. for legislative business.

On Thursday, the House will meet at 9 a.m. for legislative business, with last votes no later than 3 p.m.

We will consider several bills under suspension of the rules. A complete list of suspensions will be announced by the close of business today.

The House will also consider H. Con. Res. 24, expressing the sense of Congress that the report of Special Counsel Mueller should be made available to the public and to Congress.

Mr. SCALISE. I thank the gentleman for walking through the schedule, and I would like to ask the gentleman from Maryland about the process that we have had so far this Congress in terms of amendments that have been submitted on the House floor on legislation and the way that it has been incredibly closed, especially in a partisan way to Republican amendments.

If you look just at the bill we debated a few minutes ago, H.R. 1, only 11 percent of Republican amendments were made in order. More than 60 amendments of Democrat amendments were made in order. And if you look at the entire Congress so far this year, there were only 16 percent of Republican amendments made in order while 73 percent of Democrat amendments were made in order, which does reflect poorly on the promise that this would be a more open process.

I would ask the gentleman from Maryland, can you address at least in the future to make this a more fair and open process so that you are not closing out opportunities over and over again for Republican amendments to be made in order?

And I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for his question. I want to put it in context.

For the first time in history, we started this Congress with a government shutdown. For the first time in history. The business was not completed, the government was not fully funded, and it was necessary for us, as we began this session, to have numerous votes to open up the government. We didn't get a lot of help from your side of the aisle on doing that, and it was not about a debate; we had considered six bills that essentially had been

agreed to. There was clearly a disagreement on Homeland Security.

But let me remind you, on H.R. 1, the largest bill that we considered during the last Congress, you brought that to the floor and you had no committee hearings. Not a single committee hearing. You had no witnesses. No member of the public was able to testify. It was a closed rule, and zero amendments were made in order.

Now, let me make a comparison for you on H.R. 1, the bill we just passed. This bill had five hearings across several committees, 19 witnesses testified, the primary committee of jurisdiction had markup, and 72 amendments were made in order.

Now, H.R. 1, last Congress, zero Democratic amendments made in order. Now of course there were no Republican amendments made in order either because it was a closed rule, no amendments at all, no hearings, no committee hearings, no witnesses.

So that we have, as we said we would, had a process, opportunity for the public to testify, opportunity for amendments to be made in order. I forget exactly how many amendments you said, Republican amendments, but that is, whatever that number was, whether it was 10 or 15 or 25 or 35, more than we had in order.

As the gentleman knows, the last Congress was the most closed Congress in history. In history. We did not see a single open rule, not one under Speaker Ryan, not one. I am committed to ensuring, however, that we have a limited amount of closed rules.

Again, the gentleman is correct, the government was shut down and we had rules that we put forward to get the government open. It was not an amendment to say partially open this. It was, let's get it open.

So that my answer to the gentleman is we said what we were going to do on bills. We had 72 amendments on this bill. The proportion of amendments, the gentleman's concerned about, certainly want to make sure that we have substantive amendments considered from both sides of the aisle; that was done here. The gentleman thinks not enough, but as I said, it was, as opposed to zero, a substantial increase.

Mr. SCALISE. Well, I thank the gentleman. I would like to point out, of those 72 amendments that you identify that were made in order, only nine were Republican amendments. So when we talk about a fair and open process, the government shutdown has nothing to do with the fact that your side committed to having a more open process, and it is not. In fact, it is the reverse of what we saw last Congress.

If you look at the entire last Congress, the entire 2-year period, there were more Democrat amendments made in order under a Republican Congress than there were Republican amendments made in order. In fact, if you look at the numbers for the entire 2-year period, 38 percent of Republican amendments were made in order; 45

percent of Democrat amendments were made in order. In the overall number, 752 Democrat amendments made in order, 752. There were only 640 Republican amendments made in order. So more Democrat amendments were made in order under our majority than Republican amendments.

In this Congress so far, it is been a harshly partisan process through the Rules Committee. Again, the entire year, only 16 percent of Republican amendments made in order; 73 percent of Democrat amendments made in order.

And just looking at H.R. 1 again, we had on our side a colleague of ours, Representative FITZPATRICK. He actually led the FBI's agency on campaign finance and election crimes enforcement. He actually put people in jail who committed voter fraud, and this is a voter bill, a bill on voting rights, and you have a Member of Congress who actually worked with the FBI to put people in jail for voter fraud. He submitted seven different amendments to clean up some of the corruption that was in your bill that you just passed. Not one of his amendments was made in order. This is an FBI agent who actually put people in jail for voter fraud, not a partisan issue, and yet not one of his amendments was made in order.

So you want to talk about a closed process, let's also talk about the policy that is being closed out, and if you want to shut out efforts to clean up voter fraud, that is your prerogative, but ultimately it is not what you promised when you took the majority and if you compare it to the last Congress. Again, the entire 2-year period, more Democrat amendments were made in order than Republican amendments were made in order under our Republican majority.

I would hope in the future this process is less partisan and more fair, as it was promised to be.

On that note, I would like to ask the majority leader about a word that is swirling around regarding changes to the motion to recommit. Now, when you look at the history of Congress, this motion to recommit is more than 100 years old. It had been a custom. It had been a custom where the majority party brings a bill to the floor under a rule, and regardless of all the amendments that are allowed, at the very end of that process, the minority party gets an opportunity to make a final amendment to the bill. That is the motion to recommit.

It wasn't in the rules for a long time. And then towards the end of the Democrat majority, right before the 1994 revolution, there were efforts to take that away from the minority. So when the Republicans took over in 1994, the Newt Gingrich majority, they actually put in the rules the motion to recommit. Again, it was a custom going back 100 years. They formalized it. As the majority, they gave the minority that right in the rules. And it has always been there. It was cleaned up a little

bit over the years, but it is a tool that has been always allowed to the minority.

We are hearing—and it is rumor maybe—I would like to ask the majority leader to clarify, are there any efforts or attempts being made to change and diminish the motion to recommit? And I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for yielding. Of course, we both know, certainly since the time I have been here, that motions to recommit, on both sides of the aisle, have been gotcha amendments. They have been amendments to use for political ads to talk about partisanship. Both sides did that, understand.

So is there consternation about them? There is. Did you have an MTR today? You did. It was a difficult MTR. Of course, it dealt with a problem that does not exist at the Federal level, and it said so in the resolution, that there was not a problem that they were solving, just a sort of a sense that local communities ought to be directed what to do.

Having said that let me go back to the gentleman's question again. You said you had nine amendments. We had zero. So you could say it was 900 percent, 9,000 percent, but whatever you want to say, on H.R. 1 in your Congress and H.R. 1 in our Congress and all those figures, I think, are probably lost on the public, but what is not lost on the public or the press that has covered it extensively, last Congress was the most closed Congress in history, just as the Government being shutdown at the beginning of this Congress was the first time that happened in history, because you didn't get your job done.

But I would tell the leader, I understand the rights of the minority. We want to honor the rights of the minority, and, yes, there is a lot of discussion, but as you know, nothing has been done, and I am sure those discussions will continue.

But I understand the gentleman's point. We used the motion to recommit. You have used the motion to recommit. There is no proposed change currently under consideration.

Mr. SCALISE. I thank the gentleman for clarifying that. And I hope that tradition continues on, that this motion to recommit stays in order, because there are some Members that, if the motion to recommit passes, would vote for final passage. So that is one of the tools that are used. And if you cite, as you did, the motion to recommit that we had on H.R. 1 just a little while ago, it actually was identifying a serious problem.

It mentioned in that motion to recommit what happens in some communities where they are allowing illegals to vote, people that are here illegally, to vote in elections, whether it is school board elections or any other, and then you have a process where somebody has an ID, they are automatically sent to the voter registration files. And it creates a process

where corruption can occur, where people who are here illegally can get on voting rolls and maybe you catch it at the local level and maybe you don't, but it creates that opportunity. So we had a motion to prevent that from happening, and, unfortunately, that motion to recommit failed. But again, that is a tool that has been available for any minority to use.

And in fact, when you bring up H.R. 1 from last Congress, our bill to cut taxes for working families so that we can rebuild our middle class, which we are finally doing now because we cut taxes for everybody, people are seeing more money in their pockets; higher wages because of that bill. Heavily debated in committee; lots of amendments in committee on both sides. When it came to the floor, yes, there were no amendments on your side or on our side, but you did have a motion to recommit. So you had an amendment opportunity that we didn't have on that bill. But at the end of the day, obviously all Members on your side voted "no."

But you can see how the economy has taken off and how families actually have more money in their pockets and wages are up for working families because we cut those taxes.

So I would point that out as we move forward, hopefully, those rules don't change in a way that would try to diminish even further the opportunities that both sides have to bring amendments to the floor.

Finally, I would like to ask about the resolution that we had on the floor yesterday, the resolution to condemn all forms of bigotry, hatred. Unfortunately many of our Members felt it fell short of the objective that was stated by the majority at the beginning of the week, that there would be a resolution brought forward to actually condemn comments that were made, that were anti-Semitic by one of our Members.

And I would like to ask the gentleman, is there going to be any action taken, especially as it relates to the Foreign Affairs Committee, to remove the Member that we are talking about? And I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HOYER. I tell the gentleman, I have heard that question raised before.

You removed Mr. KING from the committees after 10 years of comments, speeches, and support for groups that did not comport with what we said yesterday in terms of rejecting bigotry and prejudice and hate. Ten years.

□ 1145

We have now twice taken action to make clear that hate and prejudice and bigotry are not the policies of this Congress, of this country, and should not be the policy of any of our Members, rhetorically.

Debating policy, having differences of opinion are clear. I don't know whether the gentleman heard my speech on the floor, but I could not, I think, have articulated more forcefully that anti-Semitism is unacceptable,

that anti-Semitism has led to grievous results, unacceptable results, the Holocaust, of course, being the most horrific.

I made that very clear. The resolution made that very clear. And yes, it did include other forms and other objects of hate and prejudice and bigotry.

And I was disappointed that 23 of your Members voted against it. Every one of my Members, without exception, voted for that resolution. So that resolution, I thought, that got over 400 of us, spoke very strongly to our opposition to anti-Semitism, to racism, to sexism, to Islamophobia.

And I haven't seen any resolution on the floor of the House when you were in charge that responded to the President of the United States stoking Islamophobia.

I saw no resolution. I saw no resolution on the floor when the President of the United States made a comment that, well, there are bad people on both sides, in Charlottesville—those holding Swastikas; those who were saying we are not going to allow the Jews to take over; those who had racist epithets and who, in fact, of course, killed one of the participants. I saw no resolution. We ultimately did get to a resolution.

But I would say to my friend, frankly, those of us on our side of the aisle think that the President too often uses words and actions that undermine the sentiment of the resolution that I voted for, that you voted for, and the overwhelming majority of the House voted for saying that is not and should not be the policy of the United States.

I won't go into more specifics, but the gentleman, I am sure, knows that I could.

What is positive is that yesterday some 400-plus of us voted to say to America and to each of our citizens and those who view America as a beacon of liberty and justice that we reject out of hand any comments, any actions that would be recognized by most people as stoking bigotry and prejudice and hate.

So, yes, that language you are talking about, as introduced, was not a final product. The final product came about through a lot of discussions and addressing the hate and bigotry and prejudice that is directed at too many people who are somehow viewed as different.

The remarks to which the gentleman referred were pointed out very clearly as being remarks which had been used through the millennia as ways to diminish the integrity of Jewish citizens and to imply that somehow their support for Israel was an indication of their lack of loyalty to their country. You and I both know that was used for centuries, millennia, to marginalize Jewish citizens and to make them feel unwelcomed and rejected.

So I think the resolution was a good thing for us to do. It passed overwhelmingly. I am sorry that 23 of your Members decided not to vote for it.

Let me go back to the MTRs.

We had a very strong statement that your side offered on anti-Semitism.

And you all voted for it; we all voted for it. Not a single Democrat voted against it. And when it came for final passage, I don't recall how many Republicans, but it was the overwhelming majority of your caucus voted against it.

So offering an amendment, having the amendment adopted, which we accepted because we thought that it was important to make that powerful statement against anti-Semitism, we adopted it.

Unfortunately, when it came to the real vote—not the political gotcha vote, but when it came to the real vote—your side all voted against it—or if not all, pretty close.

Mr. SCALISE. And as we disagree with the underlying bills, we all agree that anti-Semitism is wrong. We have been very vocal in rejecting anti-Semitism and any form of bigotry.

The issue with the resolution that was brought forward—first of all, as the gentleman, over months, has promised a 72-hour rule where there would be 72 hours to review legislation, as you acknowledged, that resolution continued to change over and over again. By the time it was filed, before Members had the opportunity to vote, there wasn't a 72-hour rule. In fact, there wasn't even a 72-minute rule. There was less than an hour to review the legislation.

As Members went through it, it included some things that we all agree should be rejected. But many Members—and I would refer the gentleman from Maryland to the statements made by the gentleman from New York (Mr. ZELDIN), who eloquently stated why that resolution fell short at its original objection: to equivocate anti-Semitism, to refuse to acknowledge that as Members spew anti-Semitism. If we can say that anti-Semitism is unacceptable—and I agree. If we say that we should reject those policies, the dual citizenship question, which is anti-Semitic, the money influence, which was offensive and anti-Semitic, we keep coming back to this because these statements continue to be made.

But if that is unacceptable, if you agree that anti-Semitism is unacceptable and bad policy, then why do you continue to leave a Member who is anti-Semitic on the committee that deals with the policy of the foreign policy of this Nation?

It is a high-profile committee. The Foreign Affairs Committee is a plumb spot. Many Members on both sides want to get on that committee because it is so important at stating our foreign policy to the world, at standing with our allies.

When you go to other countries and meet with officials, if you say you are on the Foreign Affairs Committee, it is a higher level of respect and acknowledgment that implies that your views represent the views of the United States Congress.

That is the concern where the resolution fell short.

And so many of our Members said: How many times are we going to have to keep voting on resolutions that talk generally but don't act specifically to address the problems?

And if you want to talk about the President, President Trump has been very clear and vocal, speaking out against anti-Semitism.

You saw him, just a few weeks ago, from this podium, in his State of the Union Address so eloquently bringing members to the gallery, people to the gallery: the three men who stormed Normandy Beach on D-day to liberate France and to defeat Nazis; the gentleman from Pittsburgh, the Holocaust survivor, over 90 years old, who survived the Pittsburgh shooting, who also was at Dachau.

And then for the President to so eloquently refer to one of our heroes who stormed Normandy Beach and then a year later help liberate Dachau, what a special moment for this House to see how hatred and bigotry is evil but how the might and power of the United States stands up against it.

We should all speak out against it, but we should also take the actions that, if somebody is continuing to exhibit those kind of beliefs in this Congress, they shouldn't be making policy on the committee that has jurisdiction. That has been the concern.

I hope we don't have to come back to it. I hope we don't have to keep coming back to address this problem. It shouldn't be a growing problem.

We should all stand up against it when we see it. And hopefully, we don't see it anymore because we are so clear—not just in our words, but clear in our actions.

So as we continue to, hopefully, find common ground—and there is common ground to be found. This wasn't a good week for the United States Congress to see the kind of divisions, to see it take days to come up with a simple resolution that should have taken minutes to stand up clearly against anti-Semitic actions.

So, hopefully, next week we can return to making policy where we are able to come together in a bipartisan way to address concerns and problems of this Nation.

And I know I look forward to working with the gentleman if we find that common ground. And we will, we ultimately will.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER).

Mr. HOYER. First of all, Mr. Speaker, let me say I reject out of hand the premise that we didn't speak directly to anti-Semitism in the resolution that was adopted yesterday, period. It spoke strongly to that.

Not only did it speak strongly, but if the gentleman heard my remarks, they were very strong with respect to an absolute rejection of anti-Semitism.

Now, apparently, the problem is we also spoke against racism. We also spoke against xenophobia.

I mentioned the President on xenophobia, the denigration of the dignity

of immigrants who have been so important to this country at the highest levels of our government, the allegations of widespread criminal activity in a broad bush. That resolution yesterday spoke to that.

It spoke about Islamophobia. It spoke about hatred of immigrants, of LGBT members of our society. It spoke against discrimination and hate. And, yes, it spoke directly about anti-Semitism, as it should have.

As I was absolutely committed, and the Members of this House were absolutely committed—save 23. I don't know why that 23 voted against it, but they did, not on our side of the aisle.

And I agree with the gentleman. Hopefully, we can continue to not use this as a political football, as I think it is being used.

And I am not going to cite some of the remarks of the minority leader with respect to Mr. Soros, Mr. Steier or others, Mr. JORDAN, Mr. KING. There was a difference, Mr. Speaker. We didn't wait 10 years.

Initially, we acted—the entire Democratic leadership—with a very pointed and direct letter that anti-Semitism was not acceptable, period. No confusion.

And within days, we put a suspension bill—which, by the way, the rules are waived on suspension bills. As the gentleman knows, you don't necessarily have to give 72 hours. But there were 72 hours that that was being discussed, and people knew it was being discussed, and the leader—and the whip has referred to that.

□ 1200

But I hope that nobody would diminish what we said yesterday about anti-Semitism, or racism, or any other kind ofism.

Let us not diminish what we did yesterday. I think this was a good week, Mr. Speaker, for the House of Representatives. We spoke about making sure that voting rights were protected for every American, and not only that, protected, but facilitated, made easier to register and to vote so that all Americans could express their opinion on the policies of their country and their State, and their municipality, or whatever office they were voting for.

It was a good day to say that we are going to have redistricting which is not run by the politicians, and I have been one of them that has done it so everybody understands that. Every State, not just a few, would have to have a redistricting process that was fair and balanced, and not just the politicians drawing their own districts.

It was a good day, Mr. Speaker. It was a good week, because we also spoke about making sure that we have campaign finance that discloses to everybody who the contributors are. It is ironic, Mr. Speaker, that I was here when we considered McCain-Feingold and the Republican leadership in the House and the Senate both said: "You don't need caps. You don't need to

limit spending. What you need is disclosure. Let people know who is contributing."

Well, of course, Citizens United undermined that pretty substantially, and we have millions and millions of dollars nobody knows where it comes from, so this bill did that.

This bill also said that we ought to have better ethics. We ought to not be serving on boards of profit-making corporations while we are making policies that affect them in this House. And, yes, it said the President of the United States, as every President since I have been a Member of Congress which has been since 1981, should disclose their tax returns so that the people know, are they acting in their own interest, or in the people's interest.

We called this bill the For the People Act, for voting rights, for fair registration, for campaign finance that is honest and above board and transparent, and for good ethical behavior by us and by the President.

So I disagree with my friend, the minority whip. I think this was a good week. In some ways, it was a tough week, but it was a good week. I am very pleased that not only did we adopt that resolution against hate, and prejudice, and bigotry against all, including and very pointedly, starting out with anti-Semitism.

We also adopted a bill that will give more trust and faith to the American people in their government and more access to the ballot box. It was a good bill. It was a good week.

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, if we talk about H.R. 1, what the gentleman fails to mention is that bill gives billions of dollars of taxpayer money to politicians. Many have called it the "For the Politicians Act." Most Americans across this country are hard-working. I don't want to see their taxpayer dollars go to some politician that they strongly disagree with so that they can run negative attack ads, things that people don't like to see on TV.

If somebody wants to contribute to a campaign, that is their prerogative, but no taxpayer should be forced to give billions of dollars of their taxpayer money to politicians, whether they agree or disagree with them, by coercion from the Federal Government. That is in the bill. It has felons voting. Many States have laws against felons voting.

For example, somebody brought this up and we weren't even able to get a clear answer. If somebody was convicted of child molestation in a State that prohibited them from going to schools, under your bill if they go to a school to vote—because now as a felon, as a child molester, even though that State bars them from voting, and that State bars them from going into a school—the bill gives them a hall pass to go into that school as a child molester, who, otherwise, under their State law, would be prohibited from going into that school where children are.

So there are obviously a lot of other things in that bill that concern many Americans across the country.

Getting back to the anti-Semitism debate we are having. The gentleman brought up the minority leader and other Members. The minority leader has been very vocal against anti-Semitism. Clearly, when you saw people giving outside money, over \$100 million of their own money to influence campaigns, of course, that is a subject people talk about.

Mr. HOYER. Will the gentleman yield on that point?

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, I will yield on that point, but I would like to make the point that the minority leader has been very vocal against anti-Semitism, and I just wanted to make sure that the gentleman wasn't inferring anything different in his comments.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, why in his comment did he mention three Americans of Jewish descent but didn't mention the Koch brothers, and by the way, didn't mention the gentleman from Nevada?

Mr. SCALISE. Who is also Jewish.

Mr. HOYER. Exactly. The three Jews that were mentioned were all Democrats, and the Koch brothers were not mentioned.

Mr. SCALISE. We have supporters on both sides that, regardless of their faith, give lots of money to politics.

Mr. HOYER. I agree with that.

Mr. SCALISE. Now, if the criticism was that there were big donors to Democrats, of course, that is who was being mentioned. Regardless of their faith, those were the people who were giving large amounts, tens of millions of dollars each. As you have criticized, or brought up the name of the gentleman from Nevada, nobody questions that you are making a comment about his religious faith.

Mr. HOYER. Of course not.

Mr. SCALISE. And neither should the assertion be made to anyone who brings up the three gentlemen who were mentioned.

Reclaiming my time, the bigger issue is, it is interesting that the gentleman mentioned a bunch of names. He mentioned a lot of names, but the one name he didn't mention is Ms. OMAR, who, at the beginning of this week, that was initially what the resolution was going to be, trying to address the comments made by Ms. OMAR.

Ultimately, the resolution went much further and left out that key component that many of us wanted to see addressed, many of us expected to see addressed, but a lot of people found it real interesting.

For example, in section 7 of the resolution, it condemns death threats received by Jewish and Muslim Members of Congress. Why, interestingly, were death threats to other Members of Congress left out? I surely can speak to that as so many others of our colleagues can.

All death threats against Members of Congress are wrong. Why did the resolution fall short in so many areas? Because it was so hastily put together. That is not the way we should address an issue this important.

It was supposed to be a narrow resolution. Clearly, on your side, you had a lot of division over it. There shouldn't have been division over it. This is what we ended up with, and so, yes, many of our Members felt that while we have been very clear in rejecting anti-Semitism or anti-racism, or any kind of bigotry, that the resolution fell short of what its original objective was.

Again, I hope we don't have to come back to this. I hope it doesn't continue. We can continue speaking about this, but let's be clear about who is speaking out against it, and who is continuing to engage in it.

I yield to the gentleman from Maryland, if he would like to comment further.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I urge both sides, when the leader of our Government says things that clearly offend minority groups of all stripes that we speak out. I think that is a good thing for us to do, and I am sure that we can be joined together to do exactly that.

I would also ask the gentleman to perhaps observe the extraordinary diversity representing all of America on this side of the aisle. You ought not to be surprised that in representing that diversity, they bring forward issues that we tried to also address in a resolution that said hate, bigotry, and prejudice is wrong. It is un-American.

Unfortunately, none of us have ancestors today that were free from pursuing hateful policies. We ought not to be, as I said on the floor, too sanctimonious. We are a Nation that allowed slavery and went through an extraordinary Civil War to eliminate that blot on "We hold these truths to be self-evident."

So, yes, we have a lot of diversity on our side of the aisle, and that diversity is representing its people. They are Americans, but they represent a number of Americans who are perceived as different than other Americans for some designation, either because of race, gender, color, sexual orientation, or immigrant. You name it.

Yes, we have a lot of diversity on this side of the aisle, and we tried to respect that diversity and make sure that every American knew when they read this resolution; we are against discrimination against anybody.

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, we appreciate the diversity that we have. We obviously strive to be even more diverse, but the most important diversity that we have and that we are proud of is our diversity of thought.

We are proud to respect people of all faiths. This was a Nation founded under a deep belief in God, but we don't have an established religion. We appreciate and respect people of all religious backgrounds.

One of the things I love most about going to Israel as a Catholic is that so much of the history of my faith of Jesus Christ is represented there in Israel, where you can walk the streets of Jerusalem and literally walk in the steps of Jesus. The fact is that Jewish people in Israel respect that diversity; they respect people of all faiths. And that is one of the proud, crowning achievements of the Jewish state of Israel.

If you look at where we are as a Nation, clearly, slavery is one of the stains, probably the greatest stain, of this Nation. The country struggled with it in its founding, and, ultimately, President Lincoln—the first Republican President—President Lincoln gave his life fighting to end slavery. It was in this Chamber, newly built, where they had that great debate to finally pass the 13th Amendment, one of the proudest moments of our Nation.

It was very contentious, but, ultimately, it was a struggle that had finally come to a head. Again, President Lincoln gave his life for that fight, and we still honor and respect him. In fact, we have a room right down the hall, the Lincoln Room where Abraham Lincoln as a House Member in the 1840s spent time, and we can all go, literally, sit or talk in the same place that Abraham Lincoln sat and talked as he was starting to build coalitions to end slavery, which he was ultimately able to secure.

So we continue to fight. It was wonderful to see JOHN LEWIS on the floor, a true hero, not just a hero of this Congress. We had the honor to serve with Sam Johnson, who was a great hero. He spent 7 years in the Hanoi Hilton.

It is a true honor to serve with JOHN LEWIS. And whether we disagree sometimes on politics, to be able to sit and talk with somebody who truly lived some of the toughest history of our Nation, and has the scars to prove it, and, yet, he still has love in his heart. He exhibits that love and that passion, so we are honored to be able to celebrate that diversity.

Ultimately, it is a diversity of thought that we all should fight to achieve, equality and opportunity for all men and women in this great Nation.

I yield to the gentleman, if he has anything else.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his yielding and his comments.

Let me simply add, we can honor that by our words and our actions today, and tomorrow, and every day thereafter.

Mr. SCALISE. I agree. We should continue to honor all of those goals with our words and our actions.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

ADJOURNMENT FROM FRIDAY, MARCH 8, 2019, TO MONDAY, MARCH 11, 2019

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the

House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet on Monday next, when it shall convene at noon for morning-hour debate and 2 p.m. for legislative business.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TRONE). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland? There was no objection.

□ 1215

DENOUNCING ANTI-SEMITISM

(Ms. JACKSON LEE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I first want to acknowledge the passing of a dear friend, Congressman Ralph Hall, who was a great leader and a great Texan.

But I also rise today, Mr. Speaker, to ensure that the American people know what we did this week; and that is condemning anti-Semitism as hateful expressions of intolerance that are contradictory to the values and aspirations that define the United States of America. This is the strongest, most definitive denouncing of anti-Semitism that the United States Congress has ever voted on—407 votes.

This summer I will be in my almost 30th year of sending young people to Israel in a kibbutz program named after former Congressman Mickey Leeland.

We understand the value of applauding all people, and, yes, we don't want Americans who happen to be Muslims to be discriminated against or associated with the burning towers, Muslims who have served in the United States military or white nationalists who will be willing to talk about the hatefulness against African Americans, Latinos, Native Americans, Asians, and Pacific Islanders.

Mr. Speaker, this is an important statement, and I am glad to have been associated with it. We should applaud all those who voted for it.

RECOGNIZING JOE M. STEELE OF THE STEELE CANNING COMPANY

(Mr. WOMACK asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. WOMACK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the life and legacy of the late Joe Steele, the founder of Steele Canning Company in Arkansas.

Joe grew up in northwest Arkansas and eventually enrolled at the University of Arkansas. To cover his tuition, he began canning tomatoes. This side job quickly turned into the Steele Canning Company.

The business continued to grow and relocated to Springdale. There Joe made history by shipping the first trainload of canned food in the United States and introducing Popeye brand spinach. During World War II, 70 percent of Steele's products were sent to our brave troops. One soldier even commented on the beans, saying that the

reason they are so good is because they were canned in Arkansas.

His legacy also includes the creation of the Beaver Water District, which is the primary source of water for north-west Arkansas.

For these contributions, he was posthumously inducted into the Arkansas Business Hall of Fame. I congratulate his family on this great honor.

VOTING RIGHTS

(Ms. DEAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. DEAN. Mr. Speaker, last week-end Members of Congress traveled to Alabama for a civil rights pilgrimage. In Selma we marched across the Edmund Pettus Bridge alongside Congressman JOHN LEWIS.

Mr. Speaker, 54 years ago yesterday, Congressman LEWIS was on that same bridge with hundreds of other brave Americans young and old. They were marching for the right to vote, and they were met with a wave of teargas and billy clubs. Representative LEWIS was beaten unconscious.

The trip for me was a powerful and terrible history lesson.

Today States no longer use terror to prevent citizens from voting, but they do use other means. Since the Supreme Court's 2013 Shelby decision, nearly two dozen States have implemented restrictive voter ID laws, closed polling places, and used other means to suppress minority voting.

H.R. 4, the Voting Rights Advancement Act, will erase these trends, and H.R. 1, which we passed today, strengthens democracy by ensuring clean, fair elections, prohibiting voter roll purges, and ending gerrymandering. Democracy means government by the people for the people. It lives up to the legacy of those marchers 54 years ago. Ultimately, it means making voting easier, not harder.

Let's keep our eye on the prize.

HONORING SENATOR LOUIS PATE

(Mr. ROUZER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. ROUZER. Mr. Speaker, Senator Louis Pate, of Mount Olive, North Carolina, recently retired from the North Carolina General Assembly after more than 16 years of serving the great people of eastern North Carolina. I had the pleasure and honor to serve with Louis in the North Carolina Senate. We shared representation of Wayne County, and I can attest to what a great member he was.

Senator Pate is known across the State for his leadership, compassion, and commitment to public service. He is a Vietnam war combat veteran, having served 20 years in the United States Air Force earning multiple service medals for his bravery while defending our country. His commitment to advocating for those who serve our country

was a top priority during his time in public office, and I know he has been honored to represent the fine men and women serving at Seymour Johnson Air Force Base in Goldsboro, North Carolina.

During his tenure in the State senate, Louis spent much of his time working to implement policy to strengthen and improve access to quality healthcare, including major reforms to Medicaid so the program would better meet the needs of those for whom it was designed to help.

Senator Pate's legacy as a statesman, mentor, and friend to many will continue to impact all those who cross his path. I wish him and his family many blessed days ahead.

SPECIAL INTERESTS AND BIG MONEY IN POLITICS

(Mr. TAKANO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TAKANO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the historic vote the House took to strengthen our democracy. The For the People Act will help combat corruption and bring ethics and accountability back to our political process.

I am particularly happy that the legislative changes of the Let It Go Act will be part of this bold piece of progressive legislation.

Currently, no laws exist that limit how long candidates or former government officials can hold on to their campaign funds after their campaign ends or following the conclusion of their public service. It is not their money. They should let it go.

Limits to how long surplus funds can remain in campaign accounts and how that money can be utilized must be established. With the inclusion of my amendment, this legislation will do just that.

For far too long, powerful special interests and big money in politics have silenced the voices of the American people. H.R. 1 will help shift the balance of power from a wealthy, powerful few back to the American people. Today I cast an enthusiastic vote, a "yes" vote For the People.

MOURNING THE LOSS OF GREENE COUNTY SHERIFF BRIAN TENNANT

(Mr. RESCENTHALER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. RESCENTHALER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express my condolences on the recent passing of a true public servant from my district, Greene County Sheriff, Brian Tennant. All who knew Brian will remember his devotion to our community. He served as a police officer, emergency medical technician, and volunteer firefighter. In 2010, Brian risked his own life to save several others during a terrible house fire in Waynesburg.

Shortly after this heroic act, Brian learned that he had an inoperable tumor. Despite this diagnosis and during medical treatment, Brian continued to serve. In 2014, he started his service as Greene County Sheriff.

Brian fought his illness for years, all while serving his community. He was a devoted husband and father of four sons. I am proud to have met Brian, and my thoughts and prayers go out to his loved ones during this difficult time.

NATIONAL COLORECTAL CANCER AWARENESS MONTH

(Mr. PAYNE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, Wednesday marked the seventh anniversary of the death of my father, the late Congressman Donald Payne. My father was a tireless advocate in this House, but he lost his life to colorectal cancer too early.

That is why each year I sponsor a resolution recognizing March as National Colorectal Cancer Awareness Month, a time to educate the public about the disease and the need for screening. I introduced that resolution on Wednesday, the anniversary of the loss of my father.

I also introduced the Removing Barriers to Colorectal Screening Act, a bipartisan bill joined by Representatives RODNEY DAVIS, DON McEACHIN, and DAVID MCKINLEY as co-leads. More than 100 Members have joined on as co-sponsors, and I hope the remaining Members will join as well.

Mr. Speaker, when people use Medicare to get colonoscopies, they are hit with an unexpected bill if polyps are removed. That is a monetary barrier to screening, and screening saves lives. My father, unfortunately, did not get screened for colorectal cancer. It wasn't something that people of his generation did. But we can honor his legacy by improving education and removing barriers to screening.

RECOGNIZING COACH MIKE GUZZO

(Mr. STAUBER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. STAUBER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of Coach Mike Guzzo of Silver Bay, Minnesota, for impacting the lives of countless young athletes across the great State of northern Minnesota.

When Mike and his wife moved back to his hometown of Silver Bay in 1984, they thought the move might be temporary. However, not long after his return, Mike began to coach youth hockey. Arguably it was his most important role as a coach and mentor that caused him to stay in Silver Bay for the long term.

Mike spent over 30 years coaching the great game of hockey in the great

State of hockey. At the end of this season, Mike hung up his skates and whistle and retired. When asked what he would miss most, Mike said it would be his players.

Growing up playing the sport of ice hockey myself, I will always remember the coaches for whom I played. I have carried the lessons that they taught me throughout my adult life.

Coach Guzzo, I thank you for serving as a role model to these athletes both on and off the ice. I know from my experience as a player that they will always appreciate everything that you have given to the hockey community.

I also want to thank Coach Guzzo for his dedication to the Silver Bay community and rural Minnesota. This community of Silver Bay matters, and Coach Guzzo, your life made it better.

Coach Guzzo, to you and your wife, I wish you a happy, healthy, and long retirement.

ARI HALBERSTAM AND THE JEWISH CHILDREN'S MUSEUM

(Ms. CLARKE of New York asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. CLARKE of New York. Mr. Speaker, in light of the undeniable spikes in hate speech and hate crimes and conversations we have had in the House over the past few days, I rise today in memory of Ari Halberstam, a young neighbor of mine whose life was taken 25 years ago this week when anti-Semitic hatred morphed into terrorism.

Tragically, on March 6, 1994, Ari passed away at age 16 due to gunshot wounds to the head after a terrorist attack on the ramp leading to the Brooklyn Bridge.

Mr. Speaker, we must confront hatred in all of its manifestations, be it anti-Semitic attacks that took our beloved Ari's life or the hate-fueled neo-Nazi march through Charlottesville that took the life of Heather Heyer.

Devorah Halberstam, Ari's mother and my dear friend, is a crusader for justice and a forceful advocate in New York State for the passage of Ari's Law as part of a comprehensive gun control bill prohibiting interstate gun trafficking.

Determined to bring about something symbolic of resilience, tolerance, and beauty, in 2004 Ms. Halberstam established Brooklyn's iconic Jewish Children's Museum in my district in memory of Ari. The award-winning children's museum is Ari's legacy. It is our legacy.

The uptick in acts of anti-Semitism targeting Jewish communities are truly alarming, but must be confronted. Let us remember that these acts are in no way reflective of who we are as a Nation and/or our core values of tolerance, respect, and human decency.

Let us celebrate Ari's life and legacy by coming together in respect, tolerance, and, above all else, love.

MOURNING THE LOSS OF KYLE FORTI

(Mr. BANKS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. BANKS. Mr. Speaker, it is with a heavy heart that I rise today to mourn the loss of my friend, Kyle Forti. A native of DeKalb County, Kyle was the epitome of what it means to be a Hoosier. A strong man of faith, he held deep love for his God, his family, and his country.

Mr. Speaker, as a young man, Kyle was one of the first to believe in me as I began running for public office. He worked tirelessly to help me advance the conservative values that we hold dear. On Sunday, though, Kyle's life was tragically cut short after his helicopter crashed in northern Kenya.

No amount of words can describe my pride as I watched Kyle grow and develop into a husband to Hope, a father to Max, and a successful businessman.

As his mother correctly stated, he had a passion for humanity and the human soul. Although he left us too soon, his love for people and passion for liberty will serve as an inspiration for me for the rest of my life.

□ 1230

CONGRATULATING THE NATE MACK ELEMENTARY AND GREENSPUN JUNIOR HIGH ROBOTICS TEAMS

(Mrs. LEE of Nevada asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. LEE of Nevada. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of Nevada's Third Congressional District, I rise today to congratulate the robotics teams at Nate Mack Elementary and Greenspun Junior High School for advancing to the VEX Global Robotics Competition.

Nate Mack and Greenspun schools will be representing Nevada in the global robotics competition in Louisville, Kentucky, beginning April 27 through May 1.

Though these communities served by Nate Mack and Greenspun face challenges, these students will proudly show the rest of the world the great diversity and intellect in Nevada's Third District.

On International Women's Day, it is only fitting that I recognize that these teams embrace girl-powered movement in STEAM and are 50 percent girls.

Just this week, I visited the Nate Mack and Greenspun teams and talked to the students about their experience. I even got to test-drive a robot, which was pretty cool.

Today, I want to congratulate the Nate Mack Elementary and Greenspun Junior High School robotics teams, thank them on behalf of the people of Nevada's Third District for representing us at the VEX World Robotics Competition, and wish them the best of luck.

HONORING DR. FRANCIS GRAHAM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2019, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FLORES) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. FLORES. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Dr. Francis Graham of Waco, Texas, who passed away on January 10, 2019.

Frank was born on March 19, 1930, in Sparta, Wisconsin, to Francis Graham, Sr., and Theresa Snyder Graham. He was the second of nine children.

In 1947, at the age of 16, Frank dropped out of high school and enlisted in the United States Army Air Corps. Frank later served in the U.S. Navy from 1950 to 1954 as a member of an underwater demolition team, a predecessor unit to the Navy SEALs. In 1955, Frank returned to the Army and served until 1971, when he retired as a sergeant major serving with the Special Forces.

After he retired from the military, Frank decided to continue his education and obtained his doctorate in psychology at the University of Southern Mississippi in 1976.

In 1982, Frank and his wife, Patricia, moved to Waco. For over 20 years, Frank practiced as a psychologist with the U.S. Department of Veterans Affairs and the Texas Department of Criminal Justice.

Frank was an active member of the local Special Forces chapter, the Woodway Veterans of Foreign Wars, and was the past president of both the local American Heart Association and the Italian Club of Waco. He was also involved with Saint Jerome's Catholic Church and was a Fourth Degree member of the Knights of Columbus.

Frank had a variety of hobbies, including breeding horses for racing, traveling, reading, movies, having family and friends over for game night, and being a connoisseur of fine wines and food.

Frank was also a member of my Military Service Academy Review Board, which assists in selecting candidates for nomination to our Nation's service academies.

Mr. Speaker, Frank's life was defined by his service to his family, to our country, and to our community. He will be forever remembered as a husband, a father, a grandfather, a veteran, a selfless servant, and a great friend.

My wife, Gina, and I offer our deepest and heartfelt condolences to the Graham family. We also lift up the family and friends of Frank Graham in our prayers.

I have requested that a United States flag be flown over our Nation's Capitol to honor the life and legacy this humble servant.

As I close today, I ask all Americans to continue praying for our country, for our military, for our veterans, and for our first responders who keep us safe at home.

HONORING JACK RESTIVO

Mr. FLORES. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Jack Restivo of Bryan, Texas, who passed away on March 1, 2019.

Jack was born on July 17, 1925, in Bryan, Texas, to Andrew and Corrine Restivo. He was one of 11 children.

Growing up in Bryan, he graduated from Stephen F. Austin High School and later attended Texas A&M University in College Station as a member of the class of 1946.

In 1943, in the midst of World War II, Jack left Texas A&M to join the United States Army Air Corps, and he trained to be an aerial gunner.

He was discharged in 1946 and, soon thereafter, met the love of his life, Mary Jo. They married in 1947, and Jack began his career in the insurance business in Bryan, Texas. In 1955, he was promoted and transferred to Waco.

In Waco, Jack later founded A-1 Fire and Safety Equipment Company. He and his family continued to grow this company until Jack retired in 2000.

Jack was active in supporting St. Louis Catholic Church and Reicher Catholic High School. Jack was on the school board of Reicher, and in 1986, he and Mary Jo received the Cougar Award for Excellence for their dedication to this school.

Jack loved spending time with his family and friends, golfing, traveling with Mary Jo, and everything related to Texas A&M. He was a longtime season ticket holder for Texas A&M football, baseball, men's basketball, and women's basketball. He was a member of the Texas A&M Champions Council, the Texas A&M Foundation's Legacy Society, and an endowed member of the 12th Man Foundation. He also served on the executive committee of the 12th Man Foundation.

Mr. Speaker, Jack's life was defined by his service to his family, to our country, to Texas A&M, and to our central Texas communities.

He will be forever remembered as a husband; a father; a grandfather; a great-grandfather; a veteran; a mentor; a selfless servant; and a great, great friend.

My wife, Gina, and I offer our deepest and heartfelt condolences to the Restivo family. We also lift up the family and friends of Jack Restivo in our prayers.

I have requested that a United States flag be flown over our Nation's Capitol to honor the life and legacy of this humble servant.

As I close today, I ask all Americans to continue praying for our country, for our military men and women who protect us abroad, for our first responders who protect us here at home, and for our veterans.

HONORING JOHN PAUL FRITZ

Mr. FLORES. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor John Paul Fritz of College Station, Texas, who passed away on January 8, 2019.

John Paul was born on August 31, 1989, in Houston, Texas, to John Mark

and Cathy Jane Fritz. He was the fourth of seven children.

John Paul was known for his love of the outdoors, whether it was climbing trees and building forts, or bringing home animals like rabbits, turtles, frogs, and snakes.

John Paul was initially homeschooled but later continued his education when he joined the United States Navy on November 9, 2009.

In the Navy, John Paul attended Nuclear Field "A" School and Nuclear Power School. Upon completion of his training, he was selected as a junior staff instructor for the modifications and additions to a reactor facility prototype.

In 2013, John Paul was stationed aboard the submarine USS *Florida* and completed missions that were vital to our national security.

In 2017, he was selected to become an instrumentation and control equipment instructor, the final course for nuclear electronics technicians.

It came as no surprise to anyone who knew John Paul that he was passionate about science, specifically chemistry and nuclear physics.

This last year, during Christmas, John Paul returned home and built a heat shield out of several household items. He and his friends were trying to develop a new type of efficient rocket fuel, and they hoped to start a company once he retired from the Navy.

John Paul was also known for his love of his family. He was engaged to be married this summer, and he dearly loved his daughter, Madeline Elizabeth Ann Fritz.

Unfortunately, his time on this Earth was cut short way too early.

Mr. Speaker, John Paul's life was defined by his service to his family and to our country. He will be forever remembered as a father, a sailor, a son, a brother, and a friend.

My wife, Gina, and I offer our deepest and heartfelt condolences to the Fritz family. We also lift up the family and friends of John Paul Fritz in our prayers.

I have requested that a United States flag be flown over our Nation's Capitol to honor the life and legacy of this young sailor.

As I close today, I urge all Americans to continue praying for our country, for our veterans, for our military men and women who protect us, and for our first responders who keep us safe at home.

HONORING RED CASHION

Mr. FLORES. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Red Cashion of College Station, Texas, who passed away on February 10, 2019.

Red was born on November 10, 1931, in College Station on the Texas A&M University campus. His father was the secretary of the YMCA when it was housed on the campus, and Red welcomed many Aggies to campus by letting them "rent" his red wagon as they moved into the dorms.

After graduating from A&M Consolidated High School in 1949, Red at-

tended Texas A&M University on a baseball scholarship and graduated in May 1953.

He was then commissioned as a second lieutenant in the United States Army. Red served in the Army for 4 years, working with the National Security Agency, primarily in Washington, D.C., and at Fort Meade.

During the Cuban Missile Crisis in 1963, he was recalled to Washington, where he briefed President Kennedy on the ongoing situation with Cuba.

In the 1960s and 1970s, Red raised his family in the Brazos Valley and started a business with his father-in-law and best friend. Together, they opened Burgess, Cashion & Haddox, which later became Anco Insurance. For many years, Red served as chairman emeritus at Anco.

Red's father-in-law got him interested in officiating football games. Red began to officiate junior high school games while still in college, and he eventually became a line judge for the National Football League in 1972.

In 1976, Red became a head NFL referee and ultimately officiated Super Bowls XX and XXX.

Overall, he served as an official for the NFL for 25 years, officiating more than 500 games. He was inducted into the Texas Sports Hall of Fame in 1989 and was named the NFL's Referee Association Honoree in 2011.

In 2015, he received the Art McNally Award to recognize exemplary professionalism, leadership, and commitment on and off the field.

After his retirement from the field, Red continued to work as a trainer of NFL referees and served as the referee's voice on John Madden's video game, "Madden NFL."

Although Red spent a lot of time traveling across the United States, he stayed involved in the Brazos Valley community. He served as chairman of the Bryan-College Station Chamber of Commerce, the Brazos County Industrial Foundation, the Brazos County Association of Independent Insurance Agents, and the Region VI Education Service Center.

In 1972, he was honored with the Brazos County volunteer award, and in 1994, he received the Brazos County Citizen of the Year award.

Red was also a bell ringer every holiday season with the Salvation Army.

Red was involved with many churches in Brazos Valley, first as an elder at the A&M Presbyterian Church, which his father helped found. Later, Red was a deacon at First Baptist Church in Bryan and, most recently, a member of the A&M United Methodist Church.

Like most Aggies, Red loved Texas A&M University. In 1990, Red served as the campus Muster speaker. He was also honored in 2003 by being named a Texas A&M Distinguished Alumni and has the football official's locker room inside Kyle Field named for him. Red was also later named a Mays Business School Outstanding Alumni and a Fish Camp Namesake.

He was a member of the President's Council, the 12th Man Foundation Champions Council, and the Corps of Cadets Development Council.

Until his passing, Red was also the chair of the Association of Former Students' Student Loan Trustee Committee.

Mr. Speaker, Red's life was defined by his service to his family, to our country, to the Brazos Valley, and to Texas A&M University.

He will forever be remembered as a husband; a grandfather; a great-grandfather; a veteran; a selfless servant; and a great, great friend.

My wife, Gina, and I offer our deepest and heartfelt condolences to the Cashion family. We also lift up the family and friends of Red Cashion in our prayers.

I have requested that a United States flag be flown over our Nation's Capitol to honor the life and legacy of this humble servant.

As I close today, I urge all Americans to continue praying for our country, for our veterans, for our military, and for our first responders who keep us safe at home.

□ 1245

HONORING DR. JAMES EARLE

Mr. FLORES. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Dr. James Earle of College Station, Texas, who passed away on February 4, 2019.

Jim was born on May 2, 1932, in Jacksonville, Texas, to Herbert and Edna Earle. While attending Jacksonville High School, Jim excelled in sports, particularly boxing. Jim won many Golden Gloves titles and earned the nickname "The Mangler" in high school. In high school, he also started drawing caricatures.

After graduating from high school, Jim attended Texas A&M University, where he was a member of the Corps of Cadets. While at Texas A&M, Jim organized the first boxing club and lettered in both boxing and track and field.

Jim graduated from Texas A&M in 1954 with a degree in architecture. Upon graduation, he was commissioned as a second lieutenant in the United States Air Force.

While serving in the Air Force, Jim was stationed at Dyess Air Force Base in Abilene, Texas. It was at a base event in the summer of 1957 where he met his future wife, Theresa. She sat in front of him for a caricature, and he said: "You're so pretty, I think I'm going to marry you." They married just a few months later and raised two loving daughters. They had been married 61 years at the time of his passing.

Jim completed Active Duty in 1957 and returned to Texas A&M to begin his career as an educator. He began teaching mechanical drafting to first-year engineering students. He later became the head of the Engineering Design Graphics Department. In 1964, Jim earned his Ph.D. in education. He continued to teach until 1995, when he retired.

Throughout his career, Jim was active in the American Society for Engineering Education and held many leadership positions in the Engineering Design Graphics division. From 1986 to 1991, he served as chair of the Annual Conference Committee of that organization. He was named professor emeritus of Civil Engineering in 1995 and "A Legend of Aggieland" in 2000.

During his time as a student and professor at Texas A&M, Jim created and drew a beloved cartoon character, Cadet Slouch. Jim depicted Slouch as an undergraduate cadet trying to navigate campus life. Topics included class assignments, the Aggie football team, and life in the Corps of Cadets. Cadet Slouch and his friends, Simp, Cedric, Squirt, and Fish Jethro, were published in *The Battalion*, the student newspaper, from 1955 to 1985.

When drawing Cadet Slouch cartoons, Jim was often influenced by his time as a student and, later, as a professor. The Cadet Slouch cartoon series was a commentary on the many changes going on at Texas A&M, including the enrollment of women and the voluntary participation in the Corps. Cadet Slouch was beloved by generations of Aggies while it was published.

In addition to the cartoon's run in the student newspaper, collections of Cadet Slouch cartoons were published in several books.

On a personal note, during my time at Texas A&M in the mid-seventies, I always enjoyed reading the Cadet Slouch cartoon in *The Battalion* newspaper.

In 1979, Jim and Theresa started their own publishing company. Jim wrote and published drafting workbooks at affordable prices, which were sold to more than 125 universities and colleges across the United States. Many more high schools used his textbooks to teach students mechanical drafting.

It was in these workbooks that many of Jim's graduate students advanced their own careers by contributing to the content of these books. These books introduced the concepts of techniques of engineering graphics to over a million students across the country and around the world. Jim completed his last workbook, "Engineering Graphics Designs," when he was 80 years old.

Jim's career bridged the gap between drafting by hand to three-dimensional, computer-aided design. Jim believed that one must always adapt to changes in technology, so he bought a computer and mastered AutoCAD to the extent that he was a beta tester for Autodesk. Nevertheless, he never let technology cloud the basics of good drafting and design.

Jim also had an interest in history. He served as an officer of many historical societies, including the Westerners, the National Outlaw and Lawman Association, the Western Outlaw and Lawman Association, and the Texas Gun Collectors Association.

Jim became an expert on many historical figures and published a book in 1988 about Billy the Kid. Through his publishing company, he worked with friends to bring stories of western lawmen and outlaws into reality.

Mr. Speaker, Jim's life was defined by his service to his family, to his students, to our country, and to Texas A&M University. He will be forever remembered as a husband, a father, a grandfather, a veteran, an educator, a mentor, a selfless servant, and a great friend.

My wife, Gina, and I offer our deepest and heartfelt condolences to the Earle family. We also lift up the family and friends of Jim Earle in our prayers.

I have requested the United States flag be flown over our Nation's Capitol to honor the life and legacy of this humble servant.

As I close, I urge all Americans to continue praying for our country, for our veterans, for our military who protects us, and for our first responders who keep us safe at home.

HONORING ED BERRY

Mr. FLORES. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Ed Berry of Bryan, Texas, who passed away on February 24, 2019.

Ed was born on April 22, 1940, in Waco, Texas, to Ed Berry, Sr., and to Udis White Berry. He graduated from Waco High School and attended Texas A&M University, where he was a member of the class of 1962. While at Texas A&M, Ed was a member of the Corps of Cadets, where he was a member of Squadron 4 and, ultimately, the commanding officer of Squadron 8. He was also a member of the Ross Volunteer Company. He received his degree in mathematics, and was also in the first class in the world to graduate with a master's degree in computer science.

On August 31, 1963, he married the love of his life, Barbara Teal, in Houston, Texas. They raised three sons in the Houston area and moved to Dallas in 1983. In both Houston and Dallas, Ed coached his sons' basketball and baseball teams for a total of 13 years. He also served as a deacon, a choir member, a Sunday school teacher, a Bible study leader, and a number of additional volunteer positions at South Main Baptist and Tallowood Baptist in Houston, Prestonwood Baptist in Dallas, and Travis Avenue Baptist in Fort Worth. At Prestonwood, Ed was also the chairman of the deacons and the president of the choir.

After graduating from Texas A&M, Ed went to work at NASA for IBM and contributed to the Gemini and Apollo missions. He also worked for 25 years as the information systems leader for many companies, including Sysco Foods, Zapata Corporation, and Texas Oil and Gas. He later worked in technology and management consulting for Oracle Corporation and Cambridge Energy Research Associates.

For the last 15 years, Ed worked as a Realtor. He spent 10 years as the executive director of the Bryan-College Station Association of Realtors. During his tenure, the association became one of the top three in the State of Texas.

Mr. Speaker, Ed's life was defined by his service to his family, to Texas, to our country, and to God. He will be forever remembered as a husband, a father, a grandfather, a community leader, a selfless servant, and a great friend.

My wife, Gina, and I offer our deepest and heartfelt condolences to the Berry family. We also lift up the family and friends of Ed Berry in our prayers.

I have requested the United States flag be flown over our Nation's Capitol to honor the life and legacy of this humble servant.

Also, as I close today, I urge all Americans to continue praying for our country, for our veterans, for our military who protects us, and for our first responders who keep us safe at home.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

ISSUES OF THE DAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2019, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) is recognized for the remainder of the hour as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I was listening to the colloquy earlier. I have listened to comments here during debate. I have seen comments made in the media by some of the folks here in the House over the vote that was taken, basically, on an anti-hate resolution that was originally intended to address anti-Semitic remarks that were made by a Member of the House.

Yet, instead of addressing the anti-Semitic remarks, it was made a global, general: Oh, we are against almost all hate—well, not all hate. Apparently, not the kind of hate for Republicans that would cause our minority whip, STEVE SCALISE, to be shot and almost killed; not the violence being perpetrated on supporters of President Trump, including on college campuses. But even they, as horrendous as they were, have no moral equivalence to the Holocaust.

Expanding the resolution from a simple condemnation of anti-Jewish, anti-Semitic remarks to a panoply of other items—actually attempted to give everything ever done to anyone, except a few hate-filled actions, of course—attempting to give them the moral equivalence of the Holocaust where none exists, that is tragic.

And then to compound that regrettable action by the majority in trying to please everyone, instead of standing up and calling out anti-Jewish, hate-filled remarks, biased, bigoted remarks, then came here and condemned those of us who call them out for not standing up against anti-Semitic remarks and accuse us of being hate-

filled because we took a principled stand against anti-Semitic remarks that needed to be singularized, needed to be addressed, needed to be condemned.

And not only that, to come in and also take the occasion to slander STEVE KING, saying: Well, he should have been called out 10 years ago.

No allegations, no specifics. Let's just generally slap somebody down because we don't like them; we don't like what they have said.

This is outrageous. This was no place for any of those actions, any of those comments, and I deeply regret people for whom I have had respect who would come in here and try to draw moral equivalence to every little action.

Look, I bet most of us—I know a lot of us have had plenty of death threats. We have had plenty of nasty comments made. But we don't go running to the media every time somebody threatens to kill us or somebody makes these outrageous threats or allegations.

The Holocaust was different. The suffering caused during the years of slavery in the United States really were unforgivable. It was a horrible thing to inflict on anybody.

I was shocked to find out here in February that there are more slaves in the world today—40 million—than there have ever been in the world's existence. That is horrendous.

We ought to take actions to stamp out slavery wherever it is, against whatever race or nationality, whatever. It has no place in the world.

But we know what leads to a Holocaust, the killing of millions of Jews simply because they were Jewish. It starts with maligning comments against Jews.

At first people will say, you know, that is really not appropriate. But then it gets watered down to where, well, there are a lot of bad comments against all kinds of people. You know, we are not for any of those.

And that is where we find ourselves this week in the House of Representatives. It has started.

People in this body knew which Members have made anti-Semitic feelings known in the past, so it is kind of hard to imagine that anybody would put someone who has espoused very strong anti-Semitic feelings in the past, put them on the committee where they can do the most damage to Israel and our relationship with Israel and then act like they had no idea: Let's just say that there are problems with all kinds of hate.

Well, there is a problem with not calling out the kind of comments that start the ball rolling toward another Holocaust.

□ 1300

Those of us who believe in the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, and believe, as it says up here, in that God we trust, that is the God it is talking about. That is why Moses, his full face, is up here in this body, because of the

respect for the moral laws that he gave.

But there is a danger to any civilization, any country, that will not call out anti-Semitic comments when they happen. It is not enough to put in language so that if you accuse somebody of anti-Semitic comments because they have actually made them, but they happen to be of a certain race or religion, then you get condemned. They say, oh, you are against this race, or you are against this religion, because you called them down for their anti-Semitic remarks.

That resolution yesterday leaves that kind of ambivalence out there and available to people who make anti-Semitic remarks.

It needs to stop. It needs to be called out before this body loses its moral relevance to make a difference in the world.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 1 minute p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, March 11, 2019, at noon for morning-hour debate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

361. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — S-Metolachlor; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2017-0465; FRL-9983-79] received March 7, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

362. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's direct final rule — National Oil and Hazardous Substances Pollution Contingency Plan; National Priorities List: Partial Deletion of the Robintech, Inc./National Pipe Co. Superfund Site [EPA-HQ-SFUND-1986-0005; FRL-9990-15-Region 2] received March 7, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

363. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Methoxyfenozide; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2017-0494; FRL-9985-06] received March 7, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

364. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval of State Plans for Designated Facilities and Pollutants; Kansas; Sewage Sludge Incineration Units [EPA-R07-OAR-2018-0812; FRL-9989-73-Region 7] received March 7, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

365. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Arizona; Nonattainment Plan for the Miami SO₂ Nonattainment Area [EPA-R09-OAR-2017-0621; FRL-9990-40-Region 9] received March 7, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

366. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — South Carolina; Update to Materials Incorporated by Reference [SC-2018; FRL-9990-38-Region 4] received March 7, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

367. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Air Plan Approval; Michigan; Revisions to Part 1 General Provisions Rules [EPA-R05-OAR-2017-0741; FRL-9990-42-Region 5] received March 7, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

368. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Air Plan Approval; Michigan; Infrastructure SIP Requirements for the 2012 PM_{2.5} NAAQS; Multistate Transport [EPA-R05-OAR-2017-0191; FRL-9990-41-Region 5] received March 7, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

369. A letter from the Assistant Legal Adviser, Office of Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting reports concerning international agreements other than treaties entered into by the United States to be transmitted to the Congress within the sixty-day period specified in the Case-Zablocki Act, pursuant to 1 U.S.C. 112b(a); Public Law 92-403, Sec. 1(a) (as amended by Public Law 108-458, Sec. 7121(b)); (118 Stat. 3807); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

370. A letter from the Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary for Fish and Wildlife and Parks, National Park Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Civil Penalties Inflation Adjustments [NPS-WASO-NAGPRA-27233; PPWOVPADUO/PPMPRLEIY.Y00000] (RIN: 1024-AE56) received March 7, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

371. A letter from the Assistant Director Office of Regulation Policy and Management, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting the Department's Major interim final rule — Loan Guaranty: Revisions to VA-Guaranteed or Insured Cash-out Home Refinance Loans (RIN: 2900-AQ42) received March 7, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

372. A letter from the Regulations Development Coordinator, Office of Regulation Policy and Management, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting the Department's final rule — Update: Enrollment — Provision of Hospital and Outpatient Care to Medal of Honor Veterans (RIN: 2900-AQ34) received March 7, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

373. A letter from the United States Trade Representative, Executive Office of the President, transmitting Proposed Changes to

Existing Law Required to Bring the United States Into Compliance With Obligations Under the Agreement between the United States of America, the United Mexican States, and Canada (USMCA), pursuant to 19 U.S.C. 4205(a)(1)(C); Public Law 114-26, Sec. 106(a)(1)(C); (129 Stat. 350); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

374. A letter from the Director, Regulations and Disclosure Law Division, U.S. Customs and Border Protection, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Extension of Import Restrictions Imposed on Archaeological and Ecclesiastical Ethnological Material From Honduras [CBP Dec. 19-03] (RIN: 1515-AE45) received March 7, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mrs. NAPOLITANO (for herself, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. RUSH, Mr. KILMER, Mr. MULLIN, Mr. CARBAJAL, Mr. DEFAZIO, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Ms. KAPTUR, Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN of Puerto Rico, Mr. BARR, Ms. NORTON, and Mr. LOWENTHAL):

H.R. 1638. A bill to amend title 32, United States Code, to authorize the transfer of equipment and facilities from the Federal Government or a State, Tribal, or local government to the National Guard for purposes of the National Guard Youth Challenge Program; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana (for himself, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Miss RICE of New York, and Mr. MCCAUL):

H.R. 1639. A bill to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to improve U.S. Customs and Border Protection (CBP) identification of staffing needs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Mr. KIND (for himself and Mr. FITZPATRICK):

H.R. 1640. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to provide for the admission of certain sons and daughters of citizens of the United States, which citizens served on active duty in the Armed Forces of the United States abroad, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CORREA (for himself, Mr. CLINE, and Mr. CISNEROS):

H.R. 1641. A bill to amend title 36, United States Code, to authorize The American Legion to determine the requirements for membership in The American Legion, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. JACKSON LEE (for herself and Mr. HUDSON):

H.R. 1642. A bill to authorize actions with respect to foreign countries engaged in illicit trade in tobacco products or their precursors, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN (for herself, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Ms. NORTON, Mr. NADLER, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. BROWN of Maryland, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. RUSH, and Mr. COHEN):

H.R. 1643. A bill to establish a grant program that provides grants to States, Territories of the United States, and Indian tribes for pre-exposure prophylaxis (PrEP) programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania (for himself, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. PALONE, Mr. WELCH, Mr. TONKO, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. DOGGETT, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. PAPPAS, Mr. VEASEY, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. BEYER, Mr. PHILLIPS, Mr. SARBANES, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Ms. WILD, Ms. GABBARD, Ms. PORTER, Mr. NEAL, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. CISNEROS, Ms. MOORE, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. NEGESE, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. COOPER, Mr. HIGGINS of New York, Mrs. DINGELL, Mrs. TRAHAN, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. ENGEL, Ms. DELBENE, Ms. WATERS, Ms. OMAR, Ms. DEGETTE, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. ROSE of New York, Mr. VELA, Mrs. AXNE, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. KIM, Mr. SIREN, Mr. POCAN, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. COHEN, Mr. NADLER, Mr. MALINOWSKI, Ms. HAALAND, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. SOTO, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. RYAN, Mr. PASCRELL, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. GOLDEN, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY, Mr. CASE, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mrs. LOWEY, Ms. LOFGREN, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Mr. MCEACHIN, Ms. UNDERWOOD, Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Ms. HILL of California, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. CRIST, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. SABLON, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. SHALALA, Mr. DELGADO, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. LUJÁN, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. HARDER of California, Mr. EVANS, Mr. LEVIN of California, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. ROUDA, Mr. LAMB, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. COX of California, Ms. DEAN, Mr. RASKIN, Ms. MENG, Mr. SHERMAN, Ms. NORTON, Mr. LOEBSACK, Ms. SCANLON, Mr. RUIZ, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. KEATING, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. RUSH, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. MORELLE, Mr. JEFFRIES, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. TRONE, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. CONNOLLY, Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire, Mr. GONZÁLEZ of Texas, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. TAKANO, and Mr. HOYER):

H.R. 1644. A bill to restore the open internet order of the Federal Communications Commission; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. RATCLIFFE (for himself, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. ARRINGTON, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Mr. BABIN, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. BIGGS, Mr. YOHO, Mr. WRIGHT, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. CLOUD, Mr. MCKINLEY, and Mr. GUEST):

H.R. 1645. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to provide for certain sentencing enhancements relating to illegal re-entry offenses, and to clarify the manner in which sentences for such offenses are to be served, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BERA:

H.R. 1646. A bill to require the Secretary of Health and Human Services to improve the detection, prevention, and treatment of mental health issues among public safety officers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BLUMENAUER (for himself, Mr. AMASH, Mr. GALLEG0, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. PETERS, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. COHEN, Mr. MASSIE, Ms. LEE of California, Ms. TITUS, and Ms. MCCOLLUM):

H.R. 1647. A bill to authorize Department of Veterans Affairs health care providers to provide recommendations and opinions to veterans regarding participation in State marijuana programs; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. CHABOT (for himself and Ms. VELÁZQUEZ):

H.R. 1648. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to provide for the establishment of an enhanced cybersecurity assistance and protections for small businesses, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business.

By Mr. CHABOT (for himself, Mr. EVANS, and Ms. VELÁZQUEZ):

H.R. 1649. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to require cyber certification for small business development center counselors, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business.

By Ms. CHENEY (for herself, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. HUNTER, and Mr. MEADOWS):

H.R. 1650. A bill to clarify that the Bureau of Land Management shall not require permits for oil and gas activities conducted on non-Federal surface estate to access subsurface mineral estate that is less than 50 percent federally owned, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. FORTENBERRY:

H.R. 1651. A bill to authorize assistance to be provided under certain rural development programs for the establishment or expansion of animal care facilities or veterinary practices in rural areas; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Ms. FRANKEL (for herself and Mr. BILIRAKIS):

H.R. 1652. A bill to reauthorize and improve a grant program to assist institutions of higher education in establishing, maintaining, improving, and operating Veteran Student Centers; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Ms. FRANKEL (for herself, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. KEATING, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Ms. SPANBERGER, Mr. ZELDIN, Ms. MENG, Ms. HOULAHAN, Mr. COHEN, and Mr. FITZPATRICK):

H.R. 1653. A bill to ensure that the United States recognizes women's varied roles in all aspects of violent extremism and terrorism and promotes their meaningful participation as full partners in all efforts to prevent and counter violent extremism and terrorism, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MEADOWS:

H.R. 1654. A bill to amend title 44, United States Code, to modernize the Federal Register, and for other purposes; to the Com-

mittee on Oversight and Reform, and in addition to the Committee on the Budget, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. REED (for himself, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. YOH0, and Mr. CHABOT):

H.R. 1655. A bill to provide for enhanced penalties for certain offenses relating to controlled substances containing fentanyl, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SMUCKER:

H.R. 1656. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide grants to support initiatives focused on addressing pediatric public health disparities in children's hospitals graduate medical education programs; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. SMUCKER:

H.R. 1657. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to facilitate the transition to Medicare for individuals enrolled in group health plans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. WENSTRUP (for himself, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, and Mrs. WALORSKI):

H.R. 1658. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to clarify the grade and pay of podiatrists of the Department of Veterans Affairs; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Ms. WILSON of Florida:

H.R. 1659. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to authorize the Secretary of Health and Human Services to award grants to nursing homes, assisted living facilities, and other long-term care facilities to improve their preparedness for power outages; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. WILSON of Florida:

H.R. 1660. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow employers a credit against income tax for employees who participate in qualified apprenticeship programs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ZELDIN (for himself and Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas):

H.R. 1661. A bill to provide the National Credit Union Administration Board flexibility to increase Federal credit union loan maturities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. SCOTT of Virginia (for himself and Ms. FOX of North Carolina):

H. Res. 194. A resolution providing amounts for the expenses of the Committee on Education and Labor in the One Hundred Sixteenth Congress; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. NADLER (for himself and Mr. COLLINS of Georgia):

H. Res. 195. A resolution providing amounts for the expenses of the Committee on the Judiciary in the One Hundred Sixteenth Congress; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. BISHOP of Georgia:

H. Res. 196. A resolution recognizing the American Peanut Shellers Association for their exemplary services and dedicated efforts to support our Nation's peanut industry

over the past 100 years; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Ms. CLARKE of New York (for herself, Mr. BROWN of Maryland, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Ms. JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. NORTON, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. VEASEY, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. JEFFRIES, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. MCEACHIN, and Ms. PRESSLEY):

H. Res. 197. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives with respect to Marcus Garvey; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ENGEL (for himself and Mr. MCCAUL):

H. Res. 198. A resolution providing amounts for the expenses of the Committee on Foreign Affairs in the One Hundred Sixteenth Congress; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Ms. JOHNSON of Texas:

H. Res. 199. A resolution providing amounts for the expenses of the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology in the One Hundred Sixteenth Congress; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York (for herself and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY):

H. Res. 200. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the Senate should give its advice and consent to the ratification of the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. PALLONE (for himself and Mr. WALDEN):

H. Res. 201. A resolution providing amounts for the expenses of the Committee on Energy and Commerce in the One Hundred Sixteenth Congress; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. PETERSON (for himself and Mr. CONAWAY):

H. Res. 202. A resolution providing amounts for the expenses of the Committee on Agriculture in the One Hundred Sixteenth Congress; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. SMITH of Washington (for himself and Mr. THORNBERRY):

H. Res. 203. A resolution providing amounts for the expenses of the Committee on Armed Services in the One Hundred Sixteenth Congress; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. TAKANO (for himself and Mr. DAVID P. ROE of Tennessee):

H. Res. 204. A resolution providing amounts for the expenses of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs in the One Hundred Sixteenth Congress; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Ms. VELÁZQUEZ:

H. Res. 205. A resolution providing amounts for the expenses of the Committee on Small Business in the One Hundred Sixteenth Congress; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Ms. WATERS:

H. Res. 206. A resolution acknowledging that the lack of sunlight and transparency in financial transactions and corporate formation poses a threat to our national security and our economy's security and supporting efforts to close related loopholes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers

granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mrs. NAPOLITANO:

H.R. 1638.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, clause 14: To make Rules for the Government and Regulation of the land and naval Forces;

By Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana:

H.R. 1639.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 18 of Section 8 of Article 1 of the Constitution.

By Mr. KIND:

H.R. 1640.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. CORREA:

H.R. 1641.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

(1) The U.S. Constitution including Article 1, Section 8.

By Ms. JACKSON LEE:

H.R. 1642.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN:

H.R. 1643.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18: To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 1644.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, clause 3 of the U.S. Constitution. That provision gives Congress the power "to regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian tribes."

By Mr. RATCLIFFE:

H.R. 1645.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 4 of Section 8 of Article I—The Congress shall have the Power to establish a uniform Rule of Naturalization, and uniform Laws on the subject of Bankruptcies throughout the United States.

By Mr. BERA:

H.R. 1646.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. BLUMENAUER:

H.R. 1647.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. CHABOT:

H.R. 1648.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Congress enacts this bill pursuant to Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution, which provides Congress with the ability to enact legislation to provide for the general welfare of the United States.

By Mr. CHABOT:

H.R. 1649.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Congress enacts this bill pursuant to Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution, which provides Congress with the ability to enact legislation to provide for the general welfare of the United States.

By Ms. CHENEY:

H.R. 1650.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2

Article I, Section 8 Clause 18

By Mr. FORTENBERRY:

H.R. 1651.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority for this bill is pursuant to Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. FRANKEL:

H.R. 1652.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 (Clauses 1, 12, 13, and 14) of the United States Constitution, which grants Congress the power to lay and collect taxes for the purpose of spending; to raise and support armies; to provide and maintain a navy; and to make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces.

By Ms. FRANKEL:

H.R. 1653.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. MEADOWS:

H.R. 1654.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. REED:

H.R. 1655.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. SMUCKER:

H.R. 1656.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 3 Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution

By Mr. SMUCKER:

H.R. 1657.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 3 Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution

By Mr. WENSTRUP:

H.R. 1658.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Ms. WILSON of Florida:

H.R. 1659.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Ms. WILSON of Florida:

H.R. 1660.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. ZELDIN:

H.R. 1661.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 155: Mr. CONAWAY.

H.R. 295: Ms. OMAR.

H.R. 299: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. LONG, Mr. MORELLE, Mr. PHILLIPS, Ms. SPEIER, and Mr. REED.

H.R. 303: Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Mr. SMITH of Missouri, and Mr. CALVERT.

H.R. 366: Ms. MOORE, Mr. KHANNA, and Ms. NORTON.

H.R. 500: Mrs. BUSTOS.

H.R. 510: Mr. BUTTERFIELD and Mr. GOODEN.

H.R. 511: Mr. HASTINGS.

H.R. 532: Mr. RUSH, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. CLAY, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. LAWSON of Florida, and Mr. RICHMOND.

H.R. 550: Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. COSTA, Mr. BROWN of Maryland, Mr. RICE of South Carolina, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. FITZPATRICK, and Mr. LAMB.

H.R. 553: Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. NEWHOUSE, Mr. JOHN W. ROSE of Tennessee, Mr. LAMBORN, and Mr. CALVERT.

H.R. 555: Ms. JAYAPAL.

H.R. 584: Ms. DAVIDS of Kansas.

H.R. 611: Mr. BIGGS.

H.R. 628: Mr. SPANO.

H.R. 641: Mr. POCAN.

H.R. 647: Mr. EMMER.

H.R. 649: Mr. CARTWRIGHT and Ms. JOHNSON of Texas.

H.R. 661: Mrs. HARTZLER.

H.R. 662: Mr. HASTINGS.

H.R. 677: Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ and Mr. DOGGETT.

H.R. 724: Mr. CASE, Mr. COOPER, Mr. PAPPAS, and Mr. NORCROSS.

H.R. 726: Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. MCNERNEY, and Mr. BROWN of Maryland.

H.R. 748: Mr. MORELLE, Mr. WALDEN, Mr. JEFFRIES, Mr. WENSTRUP, and Mrs. TRAHAN.

H.R. 763: Mr. SCHIFF.

H.R. 788: Mr. SPANO.

H.R. 794: Ms. NORTON.

H.R. 806: Mrs. MURPHY, Mr. KENNEDY, and Mr. HUNTER.

H.R. 846: Mr. KIM.

H.R. 869: Mr. NORCROSS and Mr. GRIJALVA.

H.R. 890: Mr. LUETKEMEYER.

H.R. 1002: Mr. KATKO and Ms. DEAN.

H.R. 1003: Ms. SANCHEZ, Mr. CUMMINGS, and Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois.

H.R. 1042: Ms. BROWNLEY of California and Ms. DEAN.

H.R. 1044: Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. COOK, Ms. WEXTON, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. LAMALFA, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. MOULTON, Mr. REED, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. NORCROSS, and Mr. BALDERSON.

H.R. 1046: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.

H.R. 1059: Mr. SPANO.

H.R. 1073: Mr. CLAY.

H.R. 1081: Mr. CHABOT, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, and Mr. WEBER of Texas.

H.R. 1098: Mr. WRIGHT.

H.R. 1154: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.

H.R. 1162: Ms. WILD.

H.R. 1174: Mr. MITCHELL.

H.R. 1212: Mr. WITTMAN and Ms. NORTON.

H.R. 1225: Ms. HILL of California and Mr. BLUMENAUER.

H.R. 1226: Mr. WENSTRUP, Mr. TURNER, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, and Mr. CHABOT.

H.R. 1236: Mr. MOULTON and Mr. RUSH.

H.R. 1266: Mr. RASKIN.

H.R. 1277: Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER.

H.R. 1287: Mr. CASTEN of Illinois, Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ, Mr. BROWN of Maryland, Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. LOFGREN, and Mrs. MCBATH.

H.R. 1297: Mr. RASKIN.

H.R. 1298: Mr. COX of California, Ms. DEAN, Ms. GARCIA of Texas, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Mr. LAWSON of Florida, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, and Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.

H.R. 1309: Ms. HILL of California.

H.R. 1325: Mr. TURNER, Mrs. RODGERS of Washington, Mr. COLE, Mr. VAN DREW, and Mr. SHIMKUS.

H.R. 1327: Mr. ROUDA, Mr. RUSH, Mr. FOSTER, and Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois.

H.R. 1354: Ms. JACKSON LEE.

H.R. 1364: Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Ms. MUCARSEL-POWELL, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. SUOZZI, and Ms. KELLY of Illinois.

H.R. 1370: Mr. GAETZ and Mr. UPTON.

H.R. 1379: Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 1407: Mr. PALAZZO.

H.R. 1410: Ms. STEFANIK.

H.R. 1434: Mr. HICE of Georgia and Mr. LAMBORN.

H.R. 1460: Mr. CRIST and Mr. BLUMENAUER.

H.R. 1519: Mr. CLEAVER.

H.R. 1521: Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ.

H.R. 1546: Ms. SCANLON.

H.R. 1549: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SERRANO, and Ms. MENG.

H.R. 1553: Ms. NORTON, Mr. COHEN, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, and Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.

H.R. 1585: Mr. NADLER, Ms. PELOSI, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mrs. FLETCHER, Mr. SUOZZI, Mr. MOULTON, Ms. STEVENS, Mr. VARGAS, Mr.

KIND, Ms. DEGETTE, Ms. MOORE, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. VELA, Mr. PAPPAS, Ms. GABBARD, Mrs. DEMINGS, Mr. MORELLE, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Ms. SÁNCHEZ, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. SCHNEIDER, Mr. CARBAJAL, Mr. SIRES, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Ms. FRANKEL, Mr. DOGGETT, Ms. NORTON, Mr. SCHIFF, Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. HIMES, Mr. LIPINSKI, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, and Ms. SPEIER.

H.R. 1587: Ms. VELÁZQUEZ.

H.R. 1588: Mr. MCNERNEY and Mr. NEGUSE.

H.R. 1596: Ms. JACKSON LEE and Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER.

H.J. Res. 2: Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, and Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts.

H.J. Res. 35: Ms. MUCARSEL-POWELL and Mr. GOLDEN.

H.J. Res. 38: Ms. MUCARSEL-POWELL, Mrs. LEE of Nevada, Mr. SUOZZI, Mr. CUELLAR, and Ms. VELÁZQUEZ.

H. Res. 54: Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. TIPTON, and Mr. ROSE of New York.

H. Res. 72: Mr. ADERHOLT.

H. Res. 88: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.

H. Res. 100: Mr. BRADY.

H. Res. 109: Mr. RUPPERSBERGER.

H. Res. 157: Ms. NORTON.

H. Res. 160: Mr. FLEISCHMANN.

H. Res. 190: Ms. GABBARD.